

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, January 19, 1926

(Legislative day of Saturday, January 16, 1926)

The Senate, as in open executive session, reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.
As in legislative session,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 90. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress trust-fund board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925; and

S. 1267. An act to extend the time for the completion of the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington, at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the State of Oregon.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 172. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 173. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between the village of Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Ontario;

H. R. 3755. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Elbert, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River;

H. R. 3852. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Columbia River at a point within 2 miles downstream from the town of Brewster, Okanogan County, State of Washington;

H. R. 4032. An act granting consent of Congress to the Brownsville & Matamoros Rapid Transit Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Brownsville, Tex.;

H. R. 4033. An act granting consent of Congress to the Hidalgo & Reynosa Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4440. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Clarke County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Chunky River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4441. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Neshoba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5027. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa.;

H. R. 5379. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 5565. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Civic Club of Grafton, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 6089. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Fox River in the county of McHenry, State of Illinois, in section 26, township 45 north, range 8 east of the third principal meridian;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the department of public works, division of highways, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to construct a bridge across the Palmer River;

H. R. 7484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark.;

H. J. Res. 64. A joint resolution to secure a replica of the Houdon bust of Washington for lodgment in the Pan American Building; and

H. J. Res. 107. A joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ESTATE TAX

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a letter to me from John S. Parker, a distinguished lawyer of New York and a well-considered memorandum by him as to the constitutionality of an estate tax.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

200 FIFTH AVENUE,
New York, January 16, 1926.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I received a few days ago the copy of your speech on the subject of the proposed estate tax law and read it with great interest.

As requested by you when I saw you at your office last Monday, I am inclosing herewith a memorandum which I have prepared as to the constitutionality of the estate-tax provisions (Title III) of the pending revenue bill. It seems to me to be beyond question that Title III, if enacted in its present form, will be held by the Supreme Court unconstitutional and void, and that the same thing may be said of the estate-tax provisions of the revenue act of 1924.

Faithfully yours,

JNO. S. PARKER.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

An act (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxes, to provide revenue, and for other purposes

MEMORANDUM AS TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TITLE III, ESTATE TAX

I. The tax imposed by Title III (estate tax) of the revenue bill of 1926, upon the transfer of the net estate of every decedent dying after the enactment of the act, is a duty or excise within the meaning of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and as such is subject to the rule of uniformity as prescribed by the first clause of that section.

Estate, inheritance, legacy, and succession taxes are duties or excises within the meaning of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution and as such are subject to the rule of uniformity. (Knowlton v. Moore, 178 U. S. 41.)

II. By reason of the inclusion in Title III of the proposed act of the provision (sec. 301 (b)) allowing a credit for estate, inheritance, legacy, and succession taxes paid to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, the whole title is rendered repugnant to the uniformity clause of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and is void.

A tax is uniform, within the meaning of the constitutional provision on that subject, when it operates with the same effect in all places where the subject of it is found. (Edye v. Robertson, 112 U. S. 580.)

The uniformity thus required is the uniformity throughout the United States of the duty, impost, and excise levied; that is, the tax levied can not be one sum upon an article at one place and a different sum upon the same article at another place. The duty received must be the same at all places throughout the United States, proportioned to the quantity of the article disposed of or the extent of the business done. * * * It is contended by the Government that the Constitution only requires a uniformity geographical in its character. That position would be satisfied if the same duty were laid in all the States, however variant it might be in different places of the same State. But it could not be sustained in the latter case

without defeating the equality, which is an essential element of the uniformity required, so far as the same is practicable. (Mr. Justice Field, in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 157 U. S. 429.)

It needs no argument to show that in its application under existing conditions in the several States of the Union there is no uniformity whatsoever in the amount of the tax, and it is no answer to the objection raised as to uniformity that the proposed law may be made to operate uniformly throughout the United States by action of the States.

In a recent case before the Supreme Court involving the constitutionality of the income tax law of the State of New York, which in its application discriminated against citizens of other States, the attorney general of New York argued that such discrimination could be removed in practice by appropriate action of the legislatures of the other States. The Supreme Court made short work of this argument, and the reasoning of the court applies with equal force to the proposed law now under consideration. The court said:

"In the brief submitted by the attorney general of New York in behalf of appellant, it is said that the framers of the act, in embodying in it the provision for unequal treatment of the residents of other States with respect to the exemptions, looked forward to the speedy adoption of an income tax by the adjoining States, in which event injustice to their citizens on the part of New York could be avoided by providing similar exemptions similarly conditioned. This, however, is wholly speculative; New York has no authority to legislate for the adjoining States; and we must pass upon its statute with respect to its effect and operation in the existing situation. But, besides, in view of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, a discrimination by the State of New York against the citizens of adjoining States would not be cured were those States to establish like discriminations against citizens of the State of New York. A State may not barter away the right conferred upon its citizens by the Constitution of the United States, to enjoy the privileges and immunities of citizens when they go into other States. Nor can discrimination be corrected by retaliation; to prevent this was one of the chief ends sought to be accomplished by the adoption of the Constitution." (Travis v. Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., 252 U. S. 60, 81, 82.)

III. Said title III is an invasion of the rights reserved to the States by Article X of the amendments to the Constitution, and for that reason also is unconstitutional and void.

The tenth amendment reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

The avowed purpose of the proponents of the provision allowing a credit for State taxes paid is to force uniformity among the States in the imposition of inheritance taxes. The report of the Ways and Means Committee contains this significant paragraph:

"A very important change was also made in the application of the estate taxes. Under the present law a credit is allowed upon the taxes of the amount of any inheritance or estate tax paid to any State, up to 25 per cent of the Federal tax. In order to give the various States full freedom to make use of this tax, the committee decided to extend the credit which might be so allowed up to 80 per cent of the Federal tax. The several States, by the use of this provision, will be enabled to make use of the inheritance tax without additional cost to its citizens."

The power to enforce uniformity of the laws of the States in their domestic affairs is not among the powers committed to Congress by the Constitution.

"We must construe the law and interpret the intent and meaning of Congress from the language of the act. * * * Does this law impose a tax with only that incidental restraint and regulation which a tax must inevitably involve? Or does it regulate by the use of the so-called tax as a penalty? * * * In the light of these features of the act, a court must be blind not to see that the so-called tax is imposed to stop the employment of children within the age limits prescribed. Its prohibitory and regulatory effect and purpose are palpable. All others can see and understand this. How can we properly shut our minds to it? * * * So here the so-called tax is a penalty to coerce people of a State to act as Congress wishes them to act in respect of a matter completely the business of the State government under the Federal Constitution." (Chief Justice Taft, in *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Company*, 259 U. S. 20, 36, 37, 39.)

The only difference in principle between the above case and the proposed law now under consideration is that whereas in the child labor case Congress merely attempted, in the language of the Chief Justice, to coerce the people of a State, here we find an attempt to coerce the sovereign States themselves in the exercise of one of the very fundamental functions of sovereignty, that is to say, the imposition of taxes upon their citizens.

"Should Congress, in the execution of its powers, adopt measures which are prohibited by the Constitution, or should Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not intrusted to the Government, it would become the painful duty of this tribunal, should a case requiring such a decision come

before it, to say that such a law was not the law of the land." (Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheaton.)

"It is the high duty and function of this court in cases regularly brought to its bar to decline to recognize or enforce seeming laws of Congress dealing with subjects not intrusted to Congress but left or committed by the supreme law of the land to the control of the States. We can not avoid the duty, even though it require us to refuse to give effect to legislation designed to promote the highest good. The good sought in unconstitutional legislation is an insidious feature, because it leads citizens and legislators of good purpose of promote it, without thought of the serious breach it will make in the ark of our covenant or the harm which will come from breaking down recognized standards. In the maintenance of local self-government, on the one hand, and the national power, on the other, our country has been able to endure and prosper for near a century and a half." (Chief Justice Taft, in *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Company* (child labor tax case), 259 U. S. 20, 37.)

"Out of a proper respect for the acts of a coordinate branch of the Government this court has gone far to sustain taxing acts as such, even though there has been ground for suspecting, from the weight of the tax, it was intended to destroy its subject. But in the act before us the presumption of validity can not prevail, because the proof of the contrary is found on the very face of its provisions. Grant the validity of this law, and all that Congress would need to do hereafter, in seeking to take over to its control any one of the great number of subjects of public interest, jurisdiction of which the States have never parted with, and which are reserved to them by the tenth amendment, would be to enact a detailed measure of complete regulation of the subject and enforce it by a so-called tax upon the departures from it. To give such magic to the word 'tax' would be to break down all constitutional limitation of the powers of Congress and completely wipe out the sovereignty of the States." (Chief Justice Taft in *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Co.* (child-labor tax case), 259 U. S. 20, 37.)

IV. Title III is void in its entirety

"It is elementary that the same statute may be in part constitutional and in part unconstitutional; and if the parts are wholly independent of each other, that which is constitutional may stand, while that which is unconstitutional will be rejected. And in the case before us there is no question as to the validity of this act, except sections 27 to 37, inclusive, which relate to the subject which has been under discussion; and as to them we think the rule laid down by Chief Justice Shaw in *Warren v. Charlestown* (2 Gray 84) is applicable—that if the different parts 'are so mutually connected with and dependent on each other, as conditions, considerations, or compensations for each other, as to warrant a belief that the legislature intended them as a whole, and that if all could not be carried into effect the legislature would not pass the residue independently, and some parts are unconstitutional, all the provisions which are thus dependent, conditional, or connected must fall with them.' Or, as the point is put by Mr. Justice Mathews in *Polindexter v. Greenhow* (114 U. S. 270, 304; 5 Sup. Ct. 903, 962): 'It is undoubtedly true that there may be cases where one part of a statute may be enforced as constitutional and another be declared inoperative and void because unconstitutional; but these are cases where the parts are so distinctly separable that each can stand alone and where the court is able to see and to declare that the intention of the legislature was that the part pronounced valid should be enforceable, even though the other should fail. To hold otherwise would be to substitute for the law intended by the legislature one they may never have been willing by itself to enact.' And again, as stated by the same eminent judge in *Sprague v. Thompson* (118 U. S. 90, 95; 6 Sup. Ct. 988), where it was urged that certain illegal exceptions in a section of a statute might be disregarded, but that the rest could stand: 'The insuperable difficulty with the application of that principle of construction to the present instance is that by rejecting the exceptions intended by the Legislature of Georgia the statute is made to enact what, confessedly, the legislature never meant. It confers upon the statute a positive operation beyond the legislative intent and beyond what anyone can say it would have enacted, in view of the illegality of the exceptions.'" (Chief Justice Fuller, in the prevailing opinion, in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 158 U. S. 601.)

Therefore if paragraph (b), allowing the credit, should be held to be unconstitutional, the whole title would fall, because it is obvious that Congress does not intend to impose the full tax without the credit.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN S. PARKER, Counsellor at Law.

NEW YORK, January 16, 1926.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of petitions, letters, and resolutions from citizens of Arizona urging adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice. I ask that the letters and resolutions with the names signed to the petitions accompanying them be printed in the RECORD; and that these papers may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters, resolutions, and petitions are as follows:

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

Phoenix, Ariz., Dec. 17, 1925.

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am transmitting to you the message of many prominent people in Phoenix and Arizona who are greatly interested in the World Court, which comes up to-day in the Senate.

For myself I was and am for the League of Nations, but we did not get it and it became a matter of politics and controversy.

I believe that the World Court is one step in the way of peace, and very sincerely hope that you can support it and vote for it in the United States Senate.

A merry Christmas and a happy New Year to you and yours.

Very sincerely,

Rev. J. C. TREAT.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Phoenix, Ariz.

The following resolution was adopted at a mass meeting at Phoenix, Ariz., November 15, 1925, Chief Justice A. G. McAllister, of the supreme court, presiding. All the members of the Supreme Court of Arizona sat, with other leading citizens, on the platform. Judge Alfred C. Lockwood, of the supreme court, presented this resolution, which had been prepared by a committee and which was unanimously adopted by vote:

"Whereas we believe that the United States of America should participate in the World Court along with other nations of the world in an attempt to substitute peaceful settlements for war in case of disputes; and

"Whereas three successive Presidents—Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge—have urged upon the Senate of the United States a favorable vote upon the entry of our country into the World Court: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting of the citizens of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Ariz., that the United States of America should, through action of the Senate, vote to enter the World Court at the earliest possible moment; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators representing Arizona and also that a copy be given to the local press."

Rev. J. C. TREAT,

For the Ministerial Association of Phoenix, Ariz.

Rev. PHILIP Y. PENDLETON,

Central Christian Church.

Rev. RICHARD E. DAY,

First Baptist Church.

Rev. HARDY E. INGRAM,

First Methodist Episcopal Church.

Resolution prepared for submission that day at close of a noonday dinner given by Bishop Atwood, of Trinity Cathedral, at his home to this committee and others in honor of Dr. Loyal Lincoln Wirt, western secretary of the National Council for the Prevention of War, San Francisco, Calif., who was the speaker of the day upon this occasion.

PHOENIX MEMBERS OF ARIZONA NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION OF WAR

Chief Justice of the Supreme Court A. G. McAllister.

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Alfred C. Lockwood.

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court H. D. Ross.

Judge Frank O. Smith, president Chamber of Commerce.

H. B. Watkins, secretary Chamber of Commerce.

C. O. Case, State superintendent of education.

John D. Loper, city superintendent of education.

E. W. Montgomery, principal Phoenix High School.

J. W. Laird, dean of Junior College, Phoenix.

Dr. A. W. Matthews, president State Teachers College, Tempe.

H. W. Benning, Young Men's Christian Association secretary.

Miss Grace Bennett, Young Woman's Christian Association secretary.

Mrs. H. B. Wilkinson, president Young Woman's Christian Association.

Mrs. C. F. Ainsworth.

Mrs. H. R. St. Claire, president Woman's Club, Phoenix.

Mrs. Samuel White, secretary Woman's Club, Phoenix.

Mrs. W. C. Foster, secretary department of international relations, Woman's Club, Phoenix.

Governor Hunt.

Mayor Whitney.

Postmaster Jones.

Mrs. Dwight B. Heard, Dr. Victor Rule, First Presbyterian Church.

Rev. H. L. Johnson, dean of Trinity Cathedral.

Dr. P. V. Pendleton, First Christian Church.

Dr. R. E. Day, First Baptist Church.

Dr. H. E. Ingham, First Methodist Episcopal Church.

Dr. C. Raymond Gray, Central Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. E. C. Roberts, Nazarene Church.

Rev. F. E. Maurer, Lutheran Church.

Rev. J. G. Treat, First Congregational Church.

Rev. T. O. Douglas, Tempe Congregational Church.

Rev. J. H. Smith, Garfield Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. R. H. Harbert, Methodist Episcopal Church.

THE MONDAY CLUB,
PRESCOTT, ARIZ.

Resolution

The Monday Club, of Prescott, Ariz., representing a membership of 163 women, at a meeting held November 23, 1925, adopted, by unanimous vote, the following resolution:

"Whereas the Monday Club believes that the United States should take its place among the nations of the world in some concerted effort looking toward peace; and

"Whereas it believes that the Permanent Court of International Justice more fully realizes American ideals for the settlement of disputes by arbitration than is now afforded by any other peace movement; and

"Whereas a resolution embodying the Harding-Hughes-Coolidge reservations, that the United States become a member of this court will come before the Senate during the session of Congress beginning December 7, 1925: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Monday Club petition the Senators from Arizona, the Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST and the Hon. RALPH H. CAMERON, also the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, chairman, to exert their best efforts to secure favorable action on the resolution that the United States join the International Court of Justice; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators from Arizona and to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; that a copy be spread upon the minutes of the Monday Club, and that copies be sent to the press for publication."

ETTA J. OLIVER,

111 North Marina Street, Prescott, Ariz.

BLANCHE L. WHETSTONE,

ESTELLE AUBREY BROWN,

Committee.

The Woman's Club of Flagstaff, Ariz., has expressed itself in favor of the United States taking its place among the other world powers in the effort to secure peace and heartily indorses Senate Resolution No. 5, known as the Swanson Resolution.

We hope you will give this your earnest attention when it comes before the Senate and work for its adoption.

Mrs. F. M. GOLD, President.

Mrs. R. E. TAYLOR, Vice President.

LAVERN, ARIZ., November 28, 1925.

Mr. ASHURST.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a copy of the resolution as indorsed by the Laveen Women's Club of Arizona.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. WM. LOGSDON, Corresponding Secretary.

Resolution

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace;

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals;

Whereas the one step that to-day is before our country looking towards everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice;

Whereas this is absolutely a nonpartisan matter: Therefore, be it Resolved, That the Laveen Women's Club go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

CENTRAL ARIZONA DISTRICT FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,

Peoria, Ariz., October 26, 1925.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution

Whereas the members of the Central Arizona District Federation of Women's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace;

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals;

Whereas the one step that to-day is before this country looking toward everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice;

Whereas this is absolutely a nonpartisan matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Arizona District Federation of Women's Clubs go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. G. L. BISSINGER,
President.

Mrs. R. D. LAKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

GILBERT, ARIZ., November 21, 1925.

TO SENATOR ASHURST:

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Woman's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace;

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals;

Whereas the one step that to-day is before this country looking toward everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice;

Whereas this is absolutely a nonpartisan matter: Therefore be it
Resolved, That the Woman's Improvement Club of Gilbert go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

Respectfully,

WOMAN'S IMPROVEMENT CLUB OF GILBERT.
Mrs. PAUL L. CRANDALL, Secretary.

MORENCI, ARIZ., November 22, 1923.

Mr. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish you would permit me to say that I am most heartily in favor of the proposal that the United States enter the Permanent Court of International Justice now established at The Hague, and that it is my earnest hope that you are of kindred mind on the matter and will be ready to give all your influence as well as your vote to accomplish this end.

I have already conveyed to you the sentiment of the congregation of which I am pastor, a unanimous expression from the best part of our population, and I am now writing to give personal expression to my own position on the question. And further, I shall be very deeply disappointed should the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate hesitate or refuse to report out this proposition or should the measure be loaded down with reservations or other limitations calculated to defeat its purpose or to make it impossible for this country to play a positive and constructive part in the great movement to secure the adjustment of international disputes by law instead of by war. For once, may I not hope that mere partisan considerations will give way and that there may be heard only the crying need of mankind for peace?

Yours very truly,

ALLAN KRICHBAUM,
Pastor, Presbyterian Church, Morenci, Ariz.

MORENCI, ARIZ., November 20, 1923.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the pastor and elders of the Presbyterian church of Morenci, Ariz., desire to state that we have been commissioned by the congregation of this church to make known to you its unanimous indorsement of the proposal that the United States enter the Permanent Court of International Justice already organized and established at The Hague as recommended by the late President Harding, and to express to you its earnest hope that you will use all your influence as well as your vote to accomplish this end.

To this we wish to add our own emphatic indorsement and to express to you our own personal feeling that our country should play a foremost part in the movement to secure lasting peace for mankind, the end of bloody war.

Yours very truly,

ALLAN KRICHBAUM,
Pastor and Moderator of Session.
L. J. OWEN,
Clerk of Session.

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., December 1, 1923.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASHURST: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Arizona. Will you not use your best efforts in this matter?

Resolved, That the conference of the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the district of Arizona, assembled in Phoenix, goes on

record as approving of and advocating the participation of the United States of America in the World Court, and that we urge upon the Senators from Arizona to support it with their votes and influence.

Resolved, That our secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our Senators in Congress."

Yours very sincerely,

BERTRAND R. COCKS, Secretary.

Signed:

J. W. Atwood, Bishop of Arizona; J. R. Jenkins, Archdeacon of Arizona; Bertrand R. Cocks, General Missionary of Arizona; Herbert L. Johnson, Dean of Trinity Cathedral, Phoenix; Edward H. Freeland, Trinity Cathedral, Phoenix; G. O. T. Bruce, St. Mark's Church, Mesa; Henry Clark Smith, St. Andrew's Church, Nogales; H. H. Gillies, Trinity Church, Kingman; A. W. Nicholls, St. Luke's Church, Prescott; George V. Harris, Epiphany Church, Flagstaff; Thos. R. Williams, Christ Church, Jerome; William J. Dixon, St. Paul's Church, Yuma; George A. Wieland, St. John's Church, Globe; E. C. Tuthill, Grace Church, Tucson.

MORENCI, ARIZ., November 22, 1923.

Senator ASHURST,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I trust that I may be permitted to convey to you as our Senator the hope that you will use your great influence and power to cause the United States to enter the Permanent Court of International Justice.

I have always favored the League of Nations, but believing that a situation has been created in the United States making it almost impossible for our country to become a member, I therefore am forced to view with favor the Permanent Court of International Justice.

With many others in our community, I am convinced that the United States of America, backed by its preponderating influence and power, can and should aid in adjusting the great difficulties in which Europe is now struggling and which may even threaten our high civilization. It would seem that America can no longer hope to keep itself free from the influences resulting from conditions obtaining in Europe.

My dear Senator, I hope that you will not consider this letter presumptuous, but an expressed hope from one of your constituency that the United States will find a way to play a great and effective part in international adjustments.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. LUTZ.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION,
Douglas, Ariz., November 30, 1923.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of the Ministerial Association of Douglas, Ariz., it was unanimously resolved that we urge upon our representatives in the United States Senate to support the "World Court" idea as suggested by our late President Harding in assisting foreign nations in getting back to normal conditions.

Sincerely yours,

S. F. FRASER, Clerk.

THE SATURDAY CLUB,
Duncan, Ariz., January 26, 1925.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The majority of the Saturday Club members of Duncan at a recent meeting voted to ask our Senators and Representative to vote in favor of United States joining the World Court on the basis of the Harding-Hughes reservation.

Dr. Agnes McKee Wallace and myself send a minority report against joining World Court.

Believe me,

Most sincerely yours,

(Mrs. ROBT.) ALICE LEE MONTGOMERY,
Corresponding Secretary of Saturday Club.

GLOBE WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Globe, Ariz., May 27, 1924.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASHURST: At a special meeting of the Globe Women's Democratic Club, May 23-24, the World Court question was discussed, and it was moved, seconded, and carried that I convey to you the decision of the club in the matter.

The discussion of the "Bok peace plan" has brought a pretty general opinion, I think I may say, that for the United States to join the

World Court with the Harding-Hughes reservation is not only safe and practicable but advisable, and such is the expressed opinion of the club.

In the words of a representative of women's organizations, "The proposal of Senator Lodge (to form a new World Court) would delay our entrance into the World Court indefinitely. What the women want is constructive action now."

We are glad that the recommendation to join the World Court has been reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee at last, and now, of course, will come the contest to get rid of the hampering Pepper reservations and to get the Harding-Hughes reservations substituted. It was said a few months ago that a poll of the Senate at that time showed that there were enough favorable to do that, and we are sincerely hoping that that action will have your earnest support.

Very respectfully yours,

STELLA L. HECHTMAN,
Recording Secretary,
Globe (Ariz.) Women's Democratic Club.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
Tucson, Ariz., February 7, 1925.

Senator H. F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: As a citizen of Arizona I desire to urge upon you the exertion of your interest to bring before the full Senate at the earliest possible date the question of the adherence of the United States to the World Court on the Harding-Hughes terms.

This great question is of outstanding importance as regards the future of civilization and the avoidance of war and its consideration should not be postponed. I feel that my self-respect as an American citizen demands every effort on my part to secure the participation of the United States in this court and I firmly believe that most of our citizens who have informed themselves as to the organization and purposes of the World Court are of the same mind.

Yours very truly,

F. L. RANSOME.

ALHAMBRA, ARIZ., December 5, 1925.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR:

Resolution

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace.

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals.

Whereas the one step that to-day is before this country looking toward everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice.

Whereas this is a nonpartisan matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alhambra neighborhood go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

Sincerely yours,

ELDA HERSHEY,
Chairman of International Relations.

Mrs. D. S. HERSHEY,
Glendale, Ariz.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ashtabula, Ohio, remonstrating against the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oneida, N. Y., and vicinity, praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice under the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes-Coolidge plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BAYARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 117) for the relief of the owner of the Coast Transit Division barge No. 4 (Rept. No. 45);

A bill (S. 493) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *British Isles* (Rept. No. 46); and

A bill (S. 1519) for the relief of the P. Dougherty Co. (Rept. No. 47).

Mr. BAYARD also, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 494) for the relief of all owners of cargo aboard the American steamship *Almirante* at the time of her collision with the U. S. S. *Hisko* (Rept. No. 48);

A bill (S. 508) for the relief of the owners of cargo laden aboard the U. S. transport *Florence Luckenbach* on or about December 27, 1918 (Rept. No. 49); and

A bill (S. 530) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Basce Indre* and all owners of cargo laden aboard said vessel at the time of her collision with the steamship *Housatonic* (Rept. No. 50).

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (S. 1170) to provide for the appointment of a commissioner of reclamation, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 51) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 2604) to establish a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2606) to prohibit offering for sale as Federal farm-loan bonds any securities not issued under the terms of the farm loan act; to limit the use of the words "Federal," "United States," or "reserve," or a combination of such words; to prohibit false advertising; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 2607) for the purpose of more effectively meeting the obligations of the existing migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain by the establishment of migratory-bird refuges to furnish in perpetuity homes for migratory birds, the provision of funds for establishing such areas, and the furnishing of adequate protection of migratory birds, for the establishment of public shooting grounds to preserve the American system of free shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2609) for the relief of James E. Van Horne; and

A bill (S. 2610) to authorize payment to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., a corporation, for damages to its rolling stock at Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J., on August 16, 1922; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2611) to improve the status of certain retired enlisted men who volunteered for duty and served as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2612) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appraise tribal property of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2613) granting a pension to Lottie M. Glazier (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 2614) to increase the efficiency of the Air Service of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2615) to authorize common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to transport any blind person, accompanied by a guide, for one fare; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 2616) for the relief of Herman Shulof;

A bill (S. 2617) for the relief of Charles D. Shay; and

A bill (S. 2618) for the relief of the National Surety Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2619) for the relief of Oliver J. Larkin and Lona Larkin, of Greencastle, Ind. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2620) for the relief of certain newspapers for advertising services rendered the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2621) to extend the benefits of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to certain soldiers of the Civil War and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 2622) making an appropriation of \$100,000 for the improvement of the harbor and the levee on the Ohio River at Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 2623) to find markets and to provide credits for financing the exportation of surplus agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND DOMAIN

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to introduce a bill which I intended to present on yesterday, but overlooked. It is a bill providing for change of the name of the Department of the Interior to the "department of public works and domain" and to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of public works and the functions of the Federal Government in the aforesaid department.

I desire to make the statement that those who are behind the bill, the engineers of the country, are not opposed to the general reorganization bill. As a matter of fact, they are heartily in favor of it. They are not having this bill introduced now to interfere with the general reorganization bill. They do not propose to press this bill until it is demonstrated that there is no possibility for the passage of the general reorganization measure. I wanted to make this statement in justice to them. They desired to have the bill introduced so they could discuss its provisions.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The bill (S. 2605) to change the name of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works and Domain and to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of the public-works functions of the Federal Government in the aforesaid department was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

IMMIGRATION OF CERTAIN WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As in legislative session, I ask leave to introduce a bill regulating immigration and naturalization of certain veterans of the World War and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The bill (S. 2608) regulating immigration and naturalization of certain veterans of the World War was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] introduced a very important bill relating to an amendment to the immigration law to permit the admission of certain Italian soldiers. I should like, as in legislative session, out of order, to present three short articles for printing in the RECORD in connection with that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York American of Monday, January 18, 1926]

FIVE THOUSAND WAR HEROES BEG REENTRY INTO UNITED STATES—FOUGHT FOR AMERICA—BARRED BY STATUTE FOR LIMITING ALIENS

The following letter, signed by some of the most prominent men in the industrial life of New York, who are of Italian extraction, has been received by the New York American:

EDITOR NEW YORK AMERICAN,

New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: May we call your attention to the astonishing fact that there are nearly 5,000 young Italians, formerly residents of this country, who after having enlisted as volunteers in the United States Army and serving this country in France now find themselves barred from coming back here by the United States immigration laws?

Having performed their full duty, they were mustered out at the end of the World War, and feeling certain that they would have no trouble getting back to the United States they went to Italy for a visit.

They merely took advantage of the fact that they were in Europe and near the land of their birth to go to see their relatives.

JUSTICE FOR THESE

We appeal to you to ask if the Hearst newspapers can not use their great influence to get justice for these young Italians, who had hoped and still hope to become good, useful American citizens.

Your newspapers have always stood for equal justice to all peoples. We are confident that after you have examined the facts you will feel, as we do, that these men should have been allowed to come back to us long ago. We ask you to work for their immediate admission to this country.

When our country needed these boys, they did not hesitate.

Many thousands of them threw everything aside and, without waiting to be drafted, enlisted voluntarily.

General Pershing was glad to have them.

They did everything that was asked of them.

They took every risk that any American citizen in the American Army took. They were among the boys who stood back of Pershing when he said, "Lafayette, we have come."

PROUD OF THEM THEN

These boys formerly trod the streets of American cities and were among the boys we sent foods and medicines to. We were glad in those days to do everything for them.

But a few short years ago some of these very boys marched down our avenues, and with our hearts full of gratitude we called them heroes. We didn't ask them where they were born.

They were American enough at heart to throw aside every consideration except the good of the American Republic. And we considered them American enough to be glad to accept the proffer of their lives.

All of the boys who are now in Italy hoping to get back here had come to the United States originally intending to become citizens. Had it not been that they saw fit to perform the greatest possible service for this country they would now probably all be American citizens.

When these boys originally came to the United States they did not expect an easy time. They knew they had to give as well as receive, and that in return for the great opportunities they would find in our land they would have to give all of their energy and ability, and that they could not help themselves without helping the United States.

WILLING TO TOIL

They knew from the history of the past that it was an uphill fight to come here as an Italian immigrant and progress to the upper rungs of the ladder of success. But they were willing to go through everything that faced them, because they knew that Uncle Sam has had occasion proudly to observe his Italian stepchildren go into high places in American art, literature, finance, and industrial development.

They showed their willingness to meet their obligation by going right into the Army when the call for men came, and before they were fairly started in the industrial army of America.

We feel that it is un-American to keep these men out. We talk as Americans, purely and simply. We think we understand the minds and hearts of all true Americans who may have been here for generations before us when we say that the founders of the American Republic would let these Italians come here and take their proper place in the life of the country they adopted.

WANT PUBLIC TO KNOW

May we urge that this matter be taken up at once by your newspapers, that you investigate the facts, and that you begin letting the entire American public know of this situation? May we ask that you work toward the introduction and passage of any necessary laws to remedy this wrong?

Your newspapers have done many glorious things in the past, and we hope you will add new glory to your name by making a great fight for these men who want to come back to us and again be a part of our national life.

Very sincerely,

RALPH CILUZZI.
ANTHONY PATERNO.
JOSEPH PIROZZI.
HARRY CHAMPOLL.
VICTOR CERANONE.
PASQUALE SIMONELLI.
ANTONIO STELLA.

N. B.—In your investigation you may find that this same situation may exist as to young men of foreign extraction other than Italian; and if you do, we pray that you will fight for their admission just as strongly as you do for the admission of the Italians.

[From the New York American of Tuesday, January 19, 1926]

BOTH HOUSES AIM TO BRING HEROES HOME—IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS DRAW BILL TO ALLOW UNITED STATES VETERANS REENTRY TO ADOPTED LAND—REPRESENTATIVE ROYAL JOHNSON OF SOUTH DAKOTA AND SENATOR REED OF PENNSYLVANIA READY TO FIGHT FOR THE MEASURE

(By John A. Kennedy, Universal Service Staff Correspondent)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—The first step in a movement by the Government to take down the barriers which now prevent the return to the United States of thousands of foreign-born American war veterans, barred by quota provisions of the immigration law, will be taken in both the House and Senate to-morrow.

At that time a concurrent bill drafted to-day by immigration officials will be introduced by Senator DAVID A. REED, Republican, of Pennsylvania, member of the Immigration Committee, and by Representative ROYAL C. JOHNSON, Republican, of South Dakota, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

LIFT BARS 12 MONTHS

The bill proposes to lift quota bars for a period of 12 months for all persons holding discharges from the armed forces of the United States.

It also will eliminate another injustice to aliens who served under the American flag by validating the naturalization papers of hundreds of American veterans whose citizenship papers were recently declared invalid by the Supreme Court.

Care is being taken in preparing the measure to see that it meets every requirement of the courts.

SPEEDY RESPONSE

This was the speedy and patriotic response to an appeal made to the Hearst newspapers by Italian-American war veterans that an almost incomprehensible injustice unwittingly done thousands of their fellow soldiers in the American Army, as well as American war veterans now in other countries, be remedied.

Already Senator REED has had informal conferences with his colleagues on the Immigration Committee with regard to the situation. Every Senator thus far interviewed is said to favor the bill.

Both Senator REED and Representative JOHNSON will press for early action by the committees to which the bill is referred, so that passage can be expedited.

More than 5,000 former American soldiers, in foreign lands, residents but not citizens of this country, who offered their lives in defense of the flag, are stranded in Italy alone, careful survey discloses.

One thousand bear scars of battle, with records of valiant heroism written both on their bodies and in their discharge papers presented by the Government when they were mustered out of service.

Thousands of American war veterans are in the same situation in other European countries. All are eager to return to the land for which they fought, but are prevented by the quota restrictions of the present immigration act.

VISITED NATIVE LANDS

The majority of their number are men who marched to the recruiting stations and volunteered in the stirring days of 1917.

When the armistice brought their period of service under the Stars and Stripes to an end, these men elected to visit their native lands to see the loved ones from whom they had been separated for years.

While the visits were in progress Uncle Sam passed a new immigration exclusion law. The quota allowed Italy was very small. Only the families of Italians then in this country could be allowed to enter.

The loyal Italians who fought and bled in France must wait. These men are still waiting.

"Ours is not an ungrateful Government," said Representative JOHNSON, himself a wounded veteran of the A. E. F., when told of the circumstances in which Italian-American veterans now find themselves.

"Every Member of Congress should and, I am sure, will be in favor of speedy enactment of this bill.

"When Congress passed the last immigration act it did not intend to bar men who have served the Stars and Stripes in times of war.

VALIANT SERVICE CITED

"The men who fought for America in time of war are certainly acceptable to her in times of peace.

"The supreme test of allegiance to a country is the test of service in war.

"I don't care how large their number, nor how far the Government will have to go to provide passage facilities for their return to the United States, these loyal Americans should be given leave to return at once."

[From the New York American of Tuesday, January 19, 1926]

UNITED STATES VETERANS' RELIEF CALLED URGENT STEP

(By Senator DAVID A. REED, United States Senator from Pennsylvania. Written for Universal Service)

WASHINGTON, January 18.

Although I am emphatically opposed to tinkering with the present immigration laws, especially as regards letting down the bars set up by the quota restrictions of the present act, I feel sure the situation in which American war veterans in Europe now find themselves should be given speedy remedy.

The men who have fought for this Government certainly have a right to live here.

Soldiers, sailors, or marines who took part in the World War, either in France or at home, received such a baptism in Americanism as should entitle them to entrance into this country without respect to quota laws.

The situation revealed by Universal Service as existing in Europe, where valiant soldiers, many of them with remarkable records on the battle fields of France, are barred from this country, should be given speedy remedy by this Government.

I earnestly hope that the bill granting them entrance, which I plan to introduce to-morrow, will be quickly adopted by both Houses of Congress.

By so doing the National Legislature will right a real wrong.

THE WORLD COURT

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask that it be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 119) was read, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States have not had the opportunity to fully inform themselves as to the true meaning of the so-called World Court; and

Whereas there is no immediate necessity for the United States to pass any resolution in reference thereto; and

Whereas it is but fair and just to give the people the right to express themselves fully and thoroughly upon this subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the date to vote upon the pending resolution and protocol of the World Court is hereby fixed for the 8th day of December, 1926.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. STANFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 120), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-ninth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. MCKINLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-ninth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 172. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 173. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between the village of Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Ontario;

H. R. 3755. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Elbert, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River;

H. R. 3852. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Columbia River at a point within 2 miles downstream from the town of Brewster, Okanogan County, State of Washington;

H. R. 4032. An act granting consent of Congress to the Brownsville & Matamoros Rapid Transit Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Brownsville, Tex.;

H. R. 4033. An act granting consent of Congress to the Hidalgo & Reynosa Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4440. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Clarke County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Chunky River, in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4441. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Neshoba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5027. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa.;

H. R. 5379. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 5565. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Civic Club, of Grafton, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 6089. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Fox River in the county of McHenry, State of Illinois, in section 26, township 45 north, range 8 east of the third principal meridian;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the department of public works, division of highways, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to construct a bridge across Palmer River; and

H. R. 7484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 64. A joint resolution to secure a replica of the Houdon bust of Washington for lodgment in the Pan American Building; to the Committee on the Library.

H. J. Res. 107. A joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POLICE RAID ON CAFÉ

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a newspaper clipping which I ask to have read, after which I desire to make a personal remark with reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Times, January 18, 1926]

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY IN LIQUOR AND TRAFFIC CASES

(By Bill Price)

When the impetuous Senator BLEASE, of South Carolina, attacks the Police Department for arresting women and releasing diplomats participating in a "likker" party at a cabaret a few nights ago he doesn't know that this diplomatic "immunity" stuff is abhorred by all Washington policemen.

The District Commissioners have reported to the State Department numerous instances of flagrant violations of traffic laws of the District by diplomatic attachés and members of their families, accompanied by the grossest insults to traffic officers who sought to make arrests, but were confronted with the "immunity" claim. Nothing has ever been done about it.

The Carolina Senator, though, is merely following his usual trail of decrying the strict application of law to the unimportant personages of life while the ones of consequence and importance get off easily; maybe never arrested at all. The "cotton-mill boys" of South Carolina and folks who have to "work for a living" have always been ardent supporters of the Senator. You can't blame them either, because he is always fighting for the "under dog" in life.

According to him, bootleggers swarm the Senate and House Office Buildings, "even come under the very dome of the Capitol," and go unmolested. "Prohibition is only for the poor devils who haven't got the money to buy liquor," or who, when they buy in pint quantities, are held to the law by enforcement officers.

Diplomatic "immunity" in whisky should extend only to foreign representatives in their own embassies or legations. When they go outside of these embassies, which are regarded as emblematic of their respective nations, they should become amenable to the laws of this country or of the District.

When diplomatic attachés openly, deliberately violate traffic laws of the District, speeding when they get ready, and endangering lives, they should be amenable to our laws, just as they would if guilty of graver crimes.

There was the case of a few days ago of the attaché of the Egyptian legation speeding at 40 miles an hour. The attaché's only excuse to the policeman who followed him and called him to account was that he was "in a hurry."

Some time ago a Washington policeman who hopped on the running board of a speeding machine had his cap grabbed off his head and contemptuously thrown to the ground. This was by "the wife of the secretary of such and such an embassy." When the officer insisted on credentials he was called a "dirty American pig."

Washington policemen simply can't help themselves. If they arrest American women who make themselves pals of foreign attachés in drinking bouts in public places they merely do their duty. American women can't mix in where tar is without getting smeared. Policemen do not make unpopular laws. They merely enforce them. If they didn't do this they would be dismissed.

The immunity of Members of Congress from arrest is antiquated and should no longer apply. This congressional immunity had its foundation in the practices of the early English parliaments. When royalty gave way to democracy in England, and parliament was established, political conditions were so bitter that it was possible for royalists to arrest on trumped-up charges a majority of the members of Parliament on their way to meetings of that body, thereby thwarting the will of the people. Members of Parliament who lived many

miles away, and were days in getting to London, were made immune to arrest, because it was felt that the people of a parliamentary district should not be deprived of representation, especially through unfair political tactics.

No such conditions prevail in this country to-day.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I wish to state, taking what Mr. Price said to be true in reference to the police department, that I do not think they should receive orders from any superior officer which would prohibit them from performing their well-defined duties. I think when such is the case it is their duty to report to some superior authority that they are being hindered in the performance of their duty by some inferior who is willing to show partiality.

The bill that I introduced yesterday does not exempt Senators or Representatives in Congress, or anyone else, but provides that all the Federal officers of the country shall be instructed to enforce all laws equally and impartially against any men or women anywhere within the limits of the United States.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the Arizona Gazette which gives an account of the session of the American National Livestock Association in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., on January 12, 13, and 14, 1926.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? If not, leave is granted.

The article is as follows:

NATIONAL MEET OPENED—PRESIDENT BIXBY IN ADDRESS TO COWMEN—VIGOROUS DENUNCIATION OF FREIGHT RATES BY SPEAKER—800 IN ATTENDANCE

Vigorous denunciation of existing livestock freight rates and of grazing fees on the national forests and a plea for better tariff protection for the industry was contained in the annual address delivered this morning at the opening session of the American National Livestock Association by President Fred H. Bixby, of Long Beach, Calif.

Following in the wake of the four all-State conventions which occupied the first two days of the week, the American National Livestock Association, with representatives from 14 Western and Middle Western States, all prominent in the cattle-growing and beef-packing interests of the country, opened its twenty-ninth annual convention at the Masonic temple this morning. More than 800 cattlemen and packers attended the initial opening.

President Bixby devoted a part of his address toward the administration of the packers and stockyards act and said that "perhaps a congressional investigation might develop something of interest."

"We believe the present freight-rate schedules on livestock are excessive, unsound, and unfair, and should be reduced," Mr. Bixby told the assembled delegates.

SAYS FEES EXCESSIVE

"We believe the present charges for grazing on the United States forest reserves are in some instances too high—in most cases more than the cost of administration of the grazing—and in many cases the mechanical administration of grazing in the forests most unsatisfactory."

"We are against commercialization of the forests," Mr. Bixby asserted, "and want tenure of our rights to be stabilized and standardized by law rather than to remain subject to the jurisdiction of some department head in Washington. We have always stood for some control of the unappropriated public domain. The 186,000,000 acres now known as public or Government land must be regulated in some equitable way so that the users of the grass on these ranges can expect protection, proper administration, and permanency of rights at the smallest cost possible. Special preference for the present users and for those whose adjacent privately owned lands are dependent upon the grazing of these Government areas must be taken into consideration."

TARIFF DEMANDED

"We must have a tariff of 6 cents a pound on green or fresh salted hides and 15 cents a pound on dry hides," Mr. Bixby declared. "This duty would increase the value of our cattle from \$2 to \$3 per head, and would work a hardship on no one. In addition to this, dressed meats, canned meats, and all other meat products should be adequately protected. There is a certain amount of protection now, but not enough."

"At present the United States is the dumping ground for all the surplus hides of the world," he continued, "and prices of our domestic production are on the world level. A fair duty on hides would put some 'pep' back into the cattle business."

Mr. Bixby also expressed dissatisfaction with the commissions now being assessed stock growers at the central markets, and the demand was made by him that these charges be reduced to a level commensurate with the price received for cattle by the stock growers.

YEAR'S WORK REVIEWED

"Among other things that we stand for," Mr. Bixby asserted, "are the eradication of predatory animals, truth in fabric, truth in meats, against unfair restrictions on oleo products, uniform sanitary and quarantine regulations, and uniform chattel mortgage laws."

In reviewing the work of the past year Mr. Bixby asserted that the association had accomplished a great deal, but that "we have not secured all that we went out for, nor all that we were justly entitled to."

"The greatest asset of a militant organization such as ours," he declared, "is that we are ready and equipped at all times to defend our rights."

FIGHTING BUREAUCRATS

Marked enthusiasm followed the reading of a letter by George K. Bowden, extending warm personal greetings and cordial good wishes of United States Senator RALPH H. CAMERON to the assembled delegates.

Advice to "get closer together, cooperate fully, and demand your just rights in the great questions of grazing fees and utilization of public lands" was the main subject in the missive wherein the Senator urged a continuance of the substantial backing of the legislative problems shown in the past year by the members of the organization.

"It is true," Senator CAMERON wrote, "that we have picked a fight with the bureaucrats in Washington, but at least we are making an honorable fight and I believe a successful one to restore to people of the West a reasonable and sane administration of these great natural resources."

Mr. CAMERON praised the members of the livestock association for their alertness in rallying to his support, and for their enthusiasm manifested when the waiver for grazing fees was first placed by him in Congress.

RULE INVOKES GUIDANCE

The first session of the convention, conducted by President Bixby, opened at 10.15 a. m. with an invocation by Rev. Victor A. Rule. Henry G. Bolce, president of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, gave the first address of welcome, after which Judge Frank O. Smith, president of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, extended hearty welcome to the visiting delegates to the gold spot, and assuring them of the hearty cooperation of the local civic organizations in any problems that might come up during their stay in the city.

The response was given by George A. Clough, delegate from San Francisco, filling the place of former President Ike T. Pryor, who was unable to be present. Mr. Clough was raised in Arizona, his grandfather having been a pioneer in this State. Organization in the agricultural projects throughout the country, he asserted, was the cause of their success and prosperity, and maintained that it was the hope of the cattlemen to so organize themselves, thus placing the cattle industry on the same basis.

AFTERNOON SESSION

He also touched lightly on the problem of labor which was facing the Southwestern States, inasmuch as the American cowboys were rapidly fading from view, giving way to Mexicans.

The problem of proposed legislation as to the national forests and public domain, which was discussed by George K. Bowden, attorney for the Senate Committee on Public Lands, was under consideration this afternoon.

Other speakers of the afternoon were: J. M. McFarlane, president of the Utah Cattle and Horse Growers' Association; Sam H. Cowen, attorney for the association at Fort Worth, Tex.; and T. H. Ramsey, president of the Pacific National Agricultural Credit Corporation, San Francisco.

THE WORLD COURT

The Senate, in open executive session, resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 5, providing for adhesion on the part of the United States to the protocol of December 16, 1920, and the adjoined statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, with reservations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BLEASE. I had two articles that I expected to read this morning with reference to the World Court, but I shall postpone reading them until a later day. I therefore yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cameron	Dill	Gerry
Bayard	Capper	Edge	Gillett
Bingham	Caraway	Ernst	Glass
Blease	Copeland	Fernald	Goff
Borah	Covzens	Ferris	Gooding
Bratton	Cummins	Fess	Greene
Brookhart	Curtis	Fletcher	Hale
Bruce	Dale	Frazier	Harrell
Butler	Deneen	George	Harris

Harrison	McMaster	Pittman	Stanfield
Hedlin	McNary	Ransdell	Stephens
Howell	Mayfield	Reed, Mo.	Swanson
Johnson	Means	Reed, Pa.	Trammell
Jones, N. Mex.	Metcalf	Robinson, Ark.	Wadsworth
Jones, Wash.	Moses	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh
Kendrick	Norbeck	Sackett	Warren
Keyes	Norris	Schall	Watson
King	Nye	Sheppard	Weller
La Follette	Oddie	Shipstead	Wheeler
Lenroot	Overman	Shortridge	Williams
McKellar	Pepper	Simmons	Willis
McKinley	Phipps	Smith	
McLean	Pine	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from California will proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the multifarious duties of a Senator of the United States sometimes preclude us from the preparation which ought to be made in a matter of the consequence of that which is pending before this body and sometimes make it impossible for us to engage in those matters in which we may be very much interested. I find myself somewhat in that situation to-day. Since I returned for the session I have been entirely engrossed with what I deem to be the most constructive piece of legislation of this decade—the development of the lower Colorado River—and I have had little opportunity to prepare, as the subject demands, an address upon the matter of the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

I realize, of course, sir, that the titanic figures upon this floor have presented this question in its every aspect. I realize, too, that there is nothing that I could add to what already has been said, nothing that I could add to that which I have said from the inception of this controversy; for, Mr. President, since February, 1923, when the late President Harding first suggested that we enter the World Court, in season and out, wherever the opportunity presented itself, I have voiced, feebly, of course, my remonstrance, and have endeavored to present the reasons which actuated me in opposing what he proposed and what is now before the Senate of the United States.

I have listened with interest whenever the opportunity was accorded me to what has been said upon this floor. I have listened to the eloquent Senators who have presented the case of the court with reservations and to the eloquent Senator, who is the leader of the opposition, who has presented the case with other reservations. Mr. President, I am opposed to the entry of the United States into this court with or without reservations. I am opposed to the entry into this court—

1. Because if the court is what its proponents insist, our entry would be an idle and futile act;

2. Because we have ready means at hand, with the right of selection, in The Hague court for the peaceful determination of every controversy;

3. Because joining the court inevitably will take us into the League of Nations;

4. Because if this court has any efficacy I decline to submit American questions to foreign judges, a majority of whom may decide our fate;

5. Because it violently wrenches this country from its American policy of 140 years and takes us finally into Europe's political life;

6. Because if behind the decisions of the court are the sanctions of the league, joining the court does not mean peace, but may involve us in Europe's strife; and

7. Because, sir, to join this court in the manner suggested, avoiding every question of consequence and asserting our aloofness whenever peace might be threatened by other countries would make us the poltroon among the nations of the earth. For this and other reasons, too, which it may be unnecessary to elaborate, I oppose the pending resolution.

Tepidly I am interested in reservations, but only tepidly. I believe, as the eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said in his original address, that reservations, after all, will be of little consequence. I recall, sir—oh, how soon we forget—I recall the struggle that we had to keep out of the League of Nations. I recall how reservations were presented of one sort or another during that momentous struggle. I also recall, as the Senator from Idaho recalled only a few days ago, the words of Lord Grey when he said, "Let them come in with the reservations; after they are in they amount to nothing." So, sir, if I believed in those words of Grey—and I do—if I believed that, after all, we are merely in some degree modifying the wrong that we insist exists in the court, I could not give my acquiescence to reservations except, in frankness, for the purpose ultimately by indirection of defeating that which I believe should be directly defeated.

Mr. President, I recognize the foreordained situation that is before this body. I recognize, sir, that no words of mine; I

recognize, sir, that no words of any man in this Chamber; I recognize, sir, there is no power within these doors that will enable us perhaps to escape from that foreordained situation. It is solely for the purpose that on the record there may be embalmed some of those things which I have said all over this country and that in the proper forum considering the question may be presented what has at other times and in other places been expressed.

This court, sir, has its votaries outside of this Chamber; this court, sir, is to be put over upon the American people not because Senators here believe wholly in it, although, of course, I question neither any man's belief nor any man's good faith; this court, sir, is to be put over on the American people because of a poisonous propaganda that has been in vogue since 1920; that failed then when we had the opportunity to go to all the American people; that succeeds only now, sir, because we have the opportunity to go to only 96 representatives of the American people. This propaganda that has been abroad in the land is like all propaganda of interested parties, where others are merely disinterested. Those with selfish interests are always alert and active; the disinterested, alas, act but sporadically and spasmodically. I smile a bit cynically when I listen to Senators on this floor speak of propaganda against the court. Propaganda against the court!

The pitiable little circulations that have been sent forth against it are of no consequence when an avalanche, a maelstrom of propaganda from New York City and from those who expect to make profit out of taking us into Europe has been, since 1920, poured forth in a constant and continuous flood. Consequently, sir, perhaps it succeeds; but finally there will come a day in this Republic, a day again like the day in 1920, when the people of the United States shall have the opportunity to express themselves upon this matter; and then, sir, with that expression, and that alone, shall we who take the position that I take to-day be satisfied and accept the result. I am not satisfied to accept a result of false, poisonous, and misleading propaganda.

Into every church, into every woman's organization, into every quasi-public association, into little children's schools the propaganda has been sent all in the sacred name of peace, all asserting, all insisting, that the only way that world peace can be brought about, the only method in which we can perform our moral duty to the world is for us to join this court.

I recall, sir, instances of propaganda in the past, instances that have succeeded, none of which, however, have been more deceptive nor of worse duplicity than this in respect to the World Court. I read, sir, only a few weeks ago of a distinguished English general who boastfully asserted in the city of New York that during the World War he had manufactured photographs of dead Germans and had put the story all over the world that the Germans were boiling their dead for fertilizer. He boastfully asserted it and he was oblivious to the enormity of what he had done until an outraged public opinion in the next few days denounced him in unmeasured terms.

I recall the propaganda during the war of children in Belgium whose arms were mutilated, and who were shockingly treated by the invaders. I remember talking to some gentlemen who had come from Brussels just after the war, who had at first commiserated people there over the atrocities that had been committed, and who were laughed at and told that no such atrocities had existed at all. I can recall propaganda of a different sort, too. I remember this beneficent arms conference that was held here in the city of Washington, that all of our pacific friends throughout the land tell us was a marvelous agency for peace, and tell us, too, how in that arms conference we contributed so much to the peace of the world. Do you know, sir, what information we had, during the period of that conference, of what was happening?

I hold in my hand a little brochure by Capt. Dudley W. Knox, of the United States Navy, a little brochure that every man who believes in his country ought to read. It is entitled "The Eclipse of American Sea Power," and it deals with the disarmament conference. It demonstrates what a fraud, a delusion, and a snare the 5-5-3 ratio is. In the very beginning of it Captain Knox quotes the remarks of Mr. Wickham Steed, the editor of the London Times, in a speech made by him a brief time after that arms conference.

Mr. Steed said:

The American delegates refused to give out any news during the conference. They left this whole matter with the British publicity agent, Lord Riddell, and I am not giving away any state secrets when I say that when Lord Riddell left Washington there was general lamentation among the American and other correspondents, who wondered where they would proceed to get the real news. That may have been

quixotic on the part of Americans, but rather than be under any suspicion of using their press to turn public opinion against nations with whom they may have had differences, they did this, and the American delegates were absolutely and honorably silent.

Read that brochure, you who say you are interested in our Navy, and I undertake to say that there is not an expert in the Navy Department to-day who is not tainted with politics but will agree with it and will tell you that the 5-5-3 ratio is a fraud, that it does not exist, and that while America scrapped warships Britain scrapped blue prints. Propaganda, though, has made our people have a different idea, and propaganda has led them to an utterly false conclusion. It is the propaganda, sir, upon this World Court, the propaganda that has invaded every avenue in this country, the propaganda that starts with the statement that the only means of obtaining peace, the only way of preventing war, the only mechanism that exists for the prevention of strife among nations, is this League of Nations court; and therefore that it is the duty of the United States of America forthwith to enter into that court.

If I undertook to tell you of the resolutions couched in just that language that have come to me I would be busy for the next 14 days, and I would be violating the ideas of debate that have been expressed by the distinguished Vice President and lay myself subject, doubtless, to a cloture thereafter—if I undertook, sir, even to pile upon this floor the resolutions and the letters from good men and women, from societies and organizations, from little children who have been lied to about this matter and who pathetically write "in the name of sacred peace, to prevent all wars in the future, for the sole purpose that there never again shall be strife between nations or men, take the United States into the league court"—if I undertook this, I would erect a wall as high as the ceiling and as broad as this Chamber.

It is a wicked thing, sir. That war is a wicked thing every man, of course, concedes. There is no normal man but that hates war. Every normal human being, to the limit of his ability, will endeavor to prevent war; but there are some things, sir, that are almost as wicked as war. A nation may fight a war, may even lose, and yet wax strong again. A nation may undergo all the agonies of war, and yet, with character untainted, again rise to great heights. But a nation, sir, whose character is corroded by hypocrisy and falsehood; a nation, sir, whose very essence and moral fiber are destroyed by insidious and false propaganda—that nation, sir, has no future at all; and what I cry out against is this propaganda, false in fact, that has been put over on the American people, and that has no justification in the facts.

Mr. President, I preach abhorrence of war; but, sir, I preach with equal emphasis abhorrence of pretense, cowardice, hypocrisy and duplicity in our national life. Personally, sir, I prefer a truculent d'Artagnan to a sniffling Pecksniff. I prefer, sir, that our people should understand; and in passing let me remark that those who are the proponents upon this floor of this measure have not indulged at all in the statements that have been made abroad in this land, and upon which the so-called public opinion of our Nation has been founded. No man here insists that this is a measure which will prevent war. No individual cognizant of the facts will insist publicly, upon his own individual responsibility, that peace will result or that war will be prevented by this impotent court—none, sir, as I propose to demonstrate before I conclude; and if it were possible I would blazon upon the sky for all these churches, for all these women's organizations, for all these good people to see throughout this land, that that which has been told them and upon which they have passed their resolutions is false in fact and has been calculated to deceive them for a base and an ignoble motive.

I recognize, sir, how many good people are interested in this question. I am not doubting them nor questioning them here. I recognize, sir, that the holiest emotions of mankind have been played upon by certain people in charge of this propaganda in behalf of the World Court. I recognize that the aspirations that distinguish man from the brute and raise him sometimes to the level of a god are the aspirations that this propaganda has utilized for the purpose of having him deal with his representatives in the Congress of the United States. Nevertheless, sir, I recognize, too, that behind this propaganda there is another force. There is another force, sir, that expects, out of this action of the United States Senate, to gain profit, to make money; and it is that sinister force behind this propaganda against which I cry out, and against which the American people ought to be warned.

Propaganda everywhere; and because so aptly the use of this propaganda recently was expressed I want to read to you a

very brief article recently appearing editorially in the American Mercury.

In six months—

Says this article—

It will be a century and a half since the Yankee brat performed the heroic feat of cutting its own umbilical cord; nevertheless, it remains at nurse, and under constant tutelage and admonition. The fount of honor is still at St. James's; the writ of that court runs both in the country clubs of Pittsburgh and Minneapolis and in the cloisters of Harvard and Yale. One recalls the solemn referendum of November 2, 1920, and one observes the persistent and even lusty prosperity of the League of Nations propaganda to-day. There are plenty of Walter Hines Pages left; the pilgrimage of the bar association last summer made a whole herd of them. And if all of them perished overnight there would still be the weekly swarms of visiting English novelists, shipping magnates, vaudeville hoofers, princes of the blood, itinerant ecclesiastics, exchange professors, note shavers, lecturers, spiritualists, horse-trainers, bootleggers. These men are illuminated by diverse and sometimes antagonistic visions. They bring various messages. But upon one subject they all agree, in public and in private, on the Long Island links and in the Broadway supper clubs, in Wall Street, and along the remotest back stretches of Chautauqua. They agree upon the moral duty of the United States. It is the moral duty of the United States, it appears, to join the League of Nations, and if not the League of Nations, then the World Court.

Then, following, another brief paragraph:

Such is the substance of the current demand that the United States repudiate the solemn referendum of 1920 and enter the league—or some antechamber of it. It is no more spontaneous than the Anglomania of 1915. There are actually not 100,000 people in the United States who show any sign of an honest yearning to put the country into the league, and of these not a thousand have ever offered a rational reason for it—that is, a reason based upon national self-interest. The rest is mere wind—music—a preposterous gabble about moral duty, issuing from England and here echoed mainly by palpable Anglomaniacs. The old propaganda machine is at work again, with its bearings red hot. It failed in 1920, but it did the trick in 1917, and now there are obvious hopes that it will do the trick again. So every incoming ship brings recruits for its crew, and Lady Diana Maudlin works the resorts of fashion as the dean of Mayfair works the resorts of piety, and judges are hauled off the bench and college presidents from the feasts of Rotary to keep it going.

Propaganda, sir! There is propaganda all over this land. But how at variance are the views that are expressed by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], those of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH], and those of the proponents of the league, who are men of responsible position, when they express themselves as to what this court is. Neither here upon this floor, nor in the addresses of those who are the heads of the agitation outside, in one or more of the colleges of this land, is the attempt ever made to say that this particular court will bring peace, or prevent war.

I realize, sir, that various reasons are suggested to us here for joining the court. I have listened with deep attention to the remarks of the Senator from Montana, and those of the Senator from Wisconsin, both of whom minimized what the court was, and undertook to demonstrate that it was nothing; and in that they admirably succeeded. Other Senators on this floor have presented other reasons for joining the World Court. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], in his very brief but pithy address, said that we should join the World Court in order that we might sell our wheat, our corn, and our hogs; and as I listened to him when he delivered that speech, and thought of the plight of the farmers of our country, I began to doubt the wisdom of the position I have maintained, and I began to see, in vision, the transportation of our wheat, our corn, and our hogs, across the ocean to Geneva, to be disposed of to the International World Court of the League of Nations. Perhaps, sir, the distinguished Senator from Illinois has thus solved the entire farming problem of his territory and the territory contiguous to it.

I listened to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], express himself in that delightful and epigrammatic way that is his, in an address that was indeed charming in character. I heard in that address none of the talk that is indulged by these organizations outside about the peace of the world, none of the stuff about the prevention of wars in the future as a result of our joining this court; not at all. I saw that for very material reasons, entirely appropriate, sir, in this material era, he would have us join the World Court. Then, in the conclusion of his address, when he spoke of Citizen Genet, and Washington's admonition, he

said, in substance, that if anything arises we do not like here—after in the court we will take the precept of Washington, that was written in words of fire during that memorable period in our history, when Genet came here from France to have us indulge in France's war, and we will say, "We stand aloof, because it is to our interest to do so."

So it will be seen that upon this floor we have a variety of reasons for joining the court. The Senator from Montana says it is a feeble and a halting step. The Senator from Wisconsin says substantially the same thing. Neither of them—and I compliment each upon the fact—seeks in any degree to substantiate the propaganda that has been put over upon the people of this land concerning this court or concerning its ultimate efficacy.

The position I maintain, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, is no new thing with me. It is the position I maintained from 1918 on; that, please God, while I am in public life and when I am retired to private life I shall yet maintain, with all the vigor that God has given me, because I believe that the step we are taking to-day, that which will soon be put over on this body, is the first false step in America's career; that its possibilities can not at the instant be foretold, and no man can say what peril the future may hold for us with that first false step taken.

There is no illusion upon the part of the league men in this country at all. There is no error in their position upon this matter. There is, in the minds of the men who fought the fight since 1918, no mistake as to what we are doing in the matter of this world court.

Oh, ye gentlemen upon this side, who pride yourselves upon your regularity, just let me make you a prophecy. After you have done the job, listen to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and other Democratic brethren on the other side of this Chamber congratulate you upon having finally approved the great Democratic doctrine and the policy of Woodrow Wilson. You will hear this with variations, and you will have it in more speeches than one in the days to come.

I congratulate my Democratic brethren upon their restraint in this debate. Clever are they in the presentation of this matter. Restrained have been their utterances, but restraint will be gone when the deed shall have been done by regulars upon this side of the Chamber, and when the deed shall have been done by the regulars on this side of the Chamber I want to be present for a couple of days, if my duties will permit, and listen to my Democratic brethren congratulate the regulars of the Republican Party upon this side.

What will happen, sir, if we enter this court? You realize, and I realize. When this matter first was bruited by the President of the United States in 1923, I indulged immediately in some facetious remarks. They are of no consequence, but because of the rejoinder they brought forth, and brought forth from the chief exponent of the League of Nations in all the West, the man in all the West who has made the fight for the League of Nations and is now making the fight for the World Court, I want to read just those few facetious sentences I uttered, and that rejoinder which came to me immediately thereafter.

When it was proposed in February, 1923, that we enter the World Court with certain reservations—"reservations!" Oh, when did we hear that word before? Reservations! Reservations! Ah, you, sir, from Montana, are consistent; you, sir, from Wisconsin, are consistent, for, if I recall aright, there was a time in the struggle concerning the League of Nations when these gentlemen sat upon an ex-parte committee for the purpose of preparing a reservation to Article X which should be put over, and under which we should enter the League of Nations. I recall how the task was almost perfected, when 16 men—call them what you please—"irreconcilables"—or call them by any epithet that may be known to the house of Morgan or to international bankers, call them anything you wish, sir, I care not, but the job was perfected and we were right at the entrance of the League of Nations when those 16 men called the thing off through the then leader of the Republican Party in this Chamber.

So it is a natural thing and a consistent thing for the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Wisconsin to be asking us to enter the World Court, with reservations, two of which, if I did not misunderstand the distinguished Senator from Montana the other day, are practically shams and the others of which are of mighty little consequence in any regard at all.

I repeat, sir, I am not interested in whether we enter the World Court with five little reservations or seven big reservations. The point is, I do not want to enter at all, for if we enter, either with three reservations or five or seven, the result will absolutely be the same; we will be tied in exactly the same fashion.

I was recurring, sir, to the remarks I made when first President Harding asked us to enter the court, and when he presented to us his reservations. I said then:

If we now do what is asked, the situation is this: We are wholly out of the league. We are in part of the league. By reservations we are out of the part of the league we are in. The part of the league we are in, and from which by reservations we get out, functions as a part of the league with our assistance.

In the language of a great editor of the West, "All of which is partly true."

Thereafter I received this letter. I here read this letter, and I read it, with permission of its author, because it is an example of intellectual honesty that shows conclusively just exactly what this world court is, just exactly what those who are the League of Nations leaders expect to do with us after we enter the World Court. The letter was dated Omaha, February 27, 1923:

MY DEAR JOHNSON: How small the world is now that electricity has put us all into one room!

Anyhow, I read in the paper this morning your sarcastic quotation from an alleged "great writer," who could perhaps be identified—"all of which is partly true."

You are quite right.

These are his words, not mine:

Your strictures on the Hughes-Root-Taft plan to sneak in the back door of the League of Nations are "partly true." Hughes's arguments for it are at most "partly true." The whole scheme is illogical, impractical, insincere, and cowardly. And I am for it. But not for these reasons. You, from your standpoint, will be quite right in being against it. There is no present practical situation calling for action. It is a purely academic, theoretical proposal. There are theoretical arguments for it which are "partly true." You can make others as good against it. I am for it, because, as an opportunist, if the Government has not the courage to walk into the league by the front door, I am willing, not to approve, but to submit to the alternative policy of sneaking in the back door. It will ultimately get us in. That is the final reason why you should be against it and I for it. But in your immediate strictures on the manner of it, I agree with you and am glad if you found my phrase one which you could use, even derisively, as a weapon in the criticism. In Lord Chesterfield's trite language: "Thus you see, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed."

There is the story. That is the story of the court. We are going into the court not for the settlement of those controversies that we have with other nations at all. We are going into the court because we are going to be taken finally into the League of Nations. It follows just as absolutely as night follows day. There can be no escape from it and, logically from the standpoint of the leaguers, there should be no escape from it. Sir, if we are to go into European broils; sir, if we are finally to destroy the policy that has been ours for 140 years; sir, if this country now in 1926 is to alter the course that has made our country what it is and go into European politics, I prefer as an American with flag flying and head high to go in the front door, as America ought to go, and not to sneak to the side door or side entrance or to be shoved through a trap door into the League of Nations. So far as I am concerned I prefer that you shall take us in as we ought to go in if we are to go in. Why should you do otherwise? What are you doing to us? You gentlemen who want to take us into the league, what do you say we are going to do hereafter?

But before coming to that particular part of the subject let me read another prophetic utterance. This prophetic utterance is of a gentleman from beyond the sea who saw and understood just exactly what would happen to us finally in the matter of the league. One of the officials of the league, Mr. Hagerup, of Norway, reporting the court's constitution to the assembly of the league away back in 1920, used this language:

You know that a representative of the United States of America, a man of the highest authority, Mr. Elihu Root, took part in the preparation of this constitution. The political party to which he belongs in the United States will soon come into power and though this party has not yet decided to go into the League of Nations it has proclaimed in a resolution that it is quite prepared to accept the court. I think I shall be voicing the general sentiments of the assembly—

That is the Assembly of the League of Nations—

when I say that this resolution has within it important results. It is a first step leading to the entrance of the United States into the league.

Does anybody doubt it? Tell me that this court is an independent body and we may join it if we see fit and then act as we desire thereafter and never be involved with the league

at all? The very logic of events, the irrefragable proof of what may transpire, makes it not only unlikely but utterly impossible that we should be in this part of the league and we shall not ultimately be a part of the league itself.

What are we to do if we join the court? The gentlemen who are proponents of the court say, "Nothing." They say to us, "You are not bound when you enter the court. You are bound to nothing at all. You get into the court," say they, "and then you stand aloof from it. You are not going in," say the proponents of the court, "to settle American questions, for already we have the mode of settling them." They deny that we are going into the court for the purpose of settling European questions. For what purpose are they going into the court? Somebody errs, Mr. President; somebody is being fooled, Mr. President. Are we fooling the American people or are we fooling the people across the sea?

It is a futile and an idle thing to say to us, "Go into this court, stand aloof from every controversy, have nothing to do with that which may mean the peace of the world if it occurs across the sea." That is exactly what the proponents say to us: "Do nothing as a member of the court and nothing can be done to you." What kind of a position is this for the United States of America? We boast that we are the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. We prate of our obligation to civilization and mankind. We tell of the things that we have done in the past and those things that we may do in the future in behalf of all humanity. Then we join the World Court, deny its jurisdiction in anything pertaining to us, and hold ourselves aloof from any question that involves Europe, the one place on the face of the earth that is likely to engender war.

Not so, Mr. President; not so at all. I would not have my country in any such position as that. If we go into the World Court, I would have my country perform its function and do its duty. Talk to me of moral obligations on the part of America to enter the court, and when we get in there deny that there is any moral obligation that rests on us in relation to any question under the sun! It can not be, sir, that that sort of a position will be maintained by us; and if it were maintained by us we would be not only the laughing stock of the world, but we would be worse—we would be the poltroon of all the nations of the earth. We will go in, if we go in, and we will do our duty; we will do it fully, we will do it accurately, and we will do it no matter what the consequences may be. But to assert what these gentlemen assert in reference to our attitude after we once go in is a position that no American should ever suggest for an instant that his country should take.

Our people generally do not understand what the court is. I found that out when wandering around the country, and you, sir, doubtless have found it out, too. What this court is is little understood, not at all understood by those who pass their resolutions and who demand that forthwith we enter it for the sake of the peace of the world.

Just visualize this court with me, sir, for a moment. Just visualize it! We understand what a court is in the ordinary acceptance of the term. We believe that our courts are maintained to remedy wrongs and to redress injuries and ultimately to administer justice. We understand courts of that sort. Assume that we reside upon a certain part of a certain street. Upon that street and next to us resides our neighbor. He is brutal. He is ruthless. He is cruel. He is grasping and he is avaricious. He is stronger than we are. He comes to us on some day when his passions are aroused and he appropriates a part of our property. He appropriates a part of our property and, not content with that, he assaults us. We rush to the near-by court and we say to the judge who is there, "This neighbor of ours, brutal, ruthless, cruel, has assaulted us. This neighbor has appropriated a part of our property. We want from your honor some measure of justice. We want our property returned and our injuries redressed." The court says, "Will your neighbor come into court?" We answer, "Of course he will not come into court. He is the wrongdoer." The court thereupon says, "I have no jurisdiction. Case dismissed."

That is exactly the thing that they are asking us to join, Mr. President. That is exactly what the World Court is, expressed in homely language. No compulsory jurisdiction has the court. No process has it by which it may compel a wrongdoer to come before it and submit itself to its arbitrations. If a nation of Europe, drunk with its power, mad with its militarism, shall encroach upon the property of another nation of Europe, then it may be called into the great World Court of International Justice? Not a bit of it. All the wrongdoing nation has to do is to say, "I will not have anything to do with your court," and the case is dismissed. No longer is there anything that may determine the righteousness of the cause or redress the wrong that may have been done.

Why, Mr. President, how many criminal nations do you think will come into the World Court after committing a criminal act? The great nations of the earth have denied it compulsory jurisdiction. We are going in under exactly the same idea, denying compulsory jurisdiction. What criminal nation encroaching upon the property of a weaker nation, doing it harm by war or otherwise, will voluntarily submit its criminality to this so-called court? Ah, sir, it is not a world court; it is not a court at all. It will not make for peace in the world.

It can not make for peace in the world. One of the chief proponents of the court, in speaking concerning it or writing in the *Christian Century*, December 24, 1925, Mr. Manley O. Hudson, admitted frankly this fact. He said:

I can not say that it has prevented any wars, nor that it will ever prevent any. I do not regard it as probable that nations would fight about the kind of legal questions which they are now willing to submit to the World Court.

What becomes of all the balderdash and the nonsense that has been spread broadcast over this land about the prevention of war by this court? It does not prevent war and it can not prevent war. But the wickedness of the proposal that is before us, the vice of it, in my opinion, is that we go into this court—go into it to do something that we know not what, and refuse to engage in anything that it may do that we do not like.

The naïve words of the President of the United States, when he first suggested it, accurately stated the facts. He said then:

It is a convenient instrumentality to which we may go but to which we can not be brought.

A convenient instrumentality to which we may go but to which we can not be brought. Accurately that describes the court. If we can not be brought to it, other nations can not be brought to it. The virtue we commend of its inability to deal with us can scarcely become a vice when applied to other nations.

It is a singular situation that presents itself here. Our Presidents—both President Harding and President Coolidge—said we are not going into the league. They asseverated that, and unquestionably in the utmost of good faith they made that asseveration. But the singular thing presented in the discussion is that the proleaguers want us to go into the court because they think the President mistaken, and the antileaguers want to keep us out of the court for precisely the same reason. It is a paradoxical situation that is thus presented, and it illustrates the danger of going into the thing.

Mr. President, something has been said during the course of the argument about party responsibility and party pledge. The platform has been read indicating that the Republican Party has pledged itself to entry into the court, and while it is quite true that the particular provision does so state, it contains in its very next line a denial of the statement itself.

But that is neither here nor there. If the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and every other party had decreed entrance into this court, I still would stand here voicing the views that are mine, without regard to the pronouncements of any party platform.

I have observed, sir, that party platforms are often for me and those of like opinions to mine to be obeyed, but are to be disregarded whenever others of different opinions may desire. I recall the debate upon this floor upon the child-labor amendment. If there were any question upon which the Republican Party had taken its stand, and taken its stand absolutely, it was the question of child labor, and yet I heard the Senator from Wisconsin taunt the Senator from New York because of the latter's stand upon the amendment. The Senator from New York, with a right that was his—because every man must determine his position according to his conscience or his judgment—the Senator from New York, the leader of his party in the great Empire State of the Union, stood here in violation of the pledge of the Republican Party in the United States. That was his right, just as it is my right to-day to stand here against the paradoxical pledge of the Republican Party concerning the World Court.

Sir, history affords example after example of just exactly that kind of independence which has been lauded and remembered, when the men who were mere rubber stamps and who merely responded to a party lash or to a partisan demand have been forgotten. I can recall historically during the Jackson period when Andrew Jackson felt himself almost at war with France. Singularly enough, the acute situation was brought about by a debt settlement. France owed us \$5,000,000; France had defaulted in the payment and had broken faith. Jackson, with that singular force of his, demanded again and again and in no uncertain terms the payment of the amount. Finally he

asked the Congress of the United States to give him an appropriation of \$500,000 to put this Nation in a state of defense. The party which was opposed to Jackson opposed his request. In the House of Representatives that party took its stand against Jackson's position; but up rose that grand old man of Massachusetts, John Quincy Adams, so hostile to Jackson that carefully he treasured everything that Jackson daily did that he did not like that he might inscribe it in his diary at night—old John Quincy Adams stood upon the floor of that House and said that when the country was at stake he knew no party, and he made the fight for the Jackson appropriation for the United States of America. I remember the words of Rutherford B. Hayes, "He serves his party best who serves his country best." I recall another instance when a Senator from the great State of Massachusetts, George F. Hoar, broke for the time being with his friend William McKinley and stood upon the floor of this body fighting the subjugation of the Philippines against the dictum of the Republican Party of the United States. I can recall how in that time the Legislature of Massachusetts reported a resolution that did it infinite credit, a resolution that I would commend to the distinguished gentlemen who now represent that State in this body.

I recall other instances as well. I can recall that in every case where the fight has been made by some individual in behalf of his Nation his name has been remembered in the annals of his country, while the individuals who responded to the party lash and to party regularity have never even had a jot or a tittle in the lines that have been written of the story of their times.

Whether the Republican Party has in one instance or another said that we should enter the league or enter the court, I care not. In 1920 the Republican Party said, if I could understand the language that was employed, we would not enter the league. I remember 31 gentlemen straining their consciences at that time and saying in substance to the people of the United States, "Elect Warren G. Harding President as the means by which we shall enter the league." I recall, I think, that among those 31 was a distinguished gentleman who has been quoted so copiously upon both sides of this Chamber—Mr. Elihu Root. I can remember how night after night in that Presidential campaign I took a delight in answering those 31 gentlemen and denying what they said to the people of the United States of America in defiance of the Republican platform. Oh, if those great men could do that, then smaller men who sit here may as well do likewise. Those 31 great men of the Republican Party, in defiance of the platform of the Republican Party, said to the Republicans and to the people of the United States the way by which we may enter the League of Nations—I speak in substance only and in paraphrase—is by the election of Warren G. Harding as President of the United States. I said I did not believe it when they said it, and I am very glad to say we are still out of the League of Nations, although, Mr. President, we are approaching dangerously close in going into the World Court.

So much, sir, for the politics of this situation. It is not for us to trouble ourselves about that at all, but while upon it, because it was so interesting to me, let me read the resolution which was reported by the Massachusetts Legislature when George F. Hoar was standing in the Senate of the United States in opposition to the President and in opposition to his party.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in General Court assembled, That Massachusetts, ever loyal in sympathy and support of the General Government, continues her unabated confidence in her Senators, and with a just pride in the eloquent and memorable words they have uttered, leaves them untrammelled in the exercise of an independent and patriotic judgment upon the momentous questions presented for their consideration.

O that we had more legislatures of that sort to-day; and, oh, sir, that we had more Senators like George F. Hoar in this body!

Here, sir, we come in this particular debate, if it be deemed appropriate, to a discussion more or less of the dangers of the court statute. I shall not, Mr. President, in detail at this time attempt a close analysis of the statute of the court, nor of the league at all. There is, however, one part of the subject concerning which a word may be quite appropriate.

Sanctions are something which in our Constitutional Convention, away back in 1787, we determined never to be a party to. Sanctions have something of a holy name, like "International World Court"; the word "sanctions" and the words "International World Court" rather go together. While it be true, sir, that in the statute of the World Court there is no provision whatever for sanctions, it is equally true that in the

League of Nations covenant there are ample provisions for just that thing.

Sanctions, sir, mean something beyond the benevolence of the pronouncement of the words. Sanctions, sir, mean either starving a people to death, starving them with a blockade, or whipping them with an army. Sanctions, sir, mean, after all, war, and sanctions, sir, may sometimes be put into operation, according to those who are best informed, to enforce the judgments of the International Court of Justice.

It is quite true that we are not a part of the league; it is quite true, sir, that sanctions we could avoid perhaps—I say only “perhaps”; we could avoid them by standing aloof—but it is equally true, sir, that if two nations, members of the league, have a judgment submitted concerning them and that judgment is denied by the one or is in some fashion resisted by the other, then the league, through its sanctions, may undertake the enforcement of that judgment. Bear in mind, sir, that means war. So out of this beatific and ethereal, this beneficent and mystical instrument called the protocol of the International Court of Justice, it is possible, sir, that war may emerge, and it is not only possible, sir, but it is quite likely that it may in some instance emerge.

But it is said, Mr. President, that we would not be a party to it. Legally, I admit it; but here are two nations of Europe, for instance, between whom there arises a controversy that threatens the peace of the world. Those two nations stand before the court; the court renders its decision. That means the peace of the world, let us say, for when they come to consider the decision ultimately one nation may be recalcitrant, it may decline absolutely to be bound, and goes its way, in war or otherwise. Then it is that the league may act, and then it is for the purpose of the preservation of the peace of the world that sanctions may be applied by the League of Nations, sanctions by means of which either the people of the recalcitrant state shall be starved or shall be beaten into submission by cannon and by the shedding of blood.

Then the United States of America, harbinger of peace on earth and the one great country with a moral obligation that is talked of so much, scoots across the sea and says, “The peace of the world being in danger we run and we are going to have nothing to do with it; we will not contribute to it in the slightest degree.” Nonsense, sir; nonsense; we never would act in that way, and we would not want our Nation to act in that way. We would do our part; we would play our part exactly as America ever has played her part and has ever done her duty. Sanctions, sir, says Mr. Hudson, are in these decisions. Sanctions, sir, says every individual familiar with the situation, are in these decisions. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in an article which he published in the Nation, said:

The League of Nations is a treaty or agreement between a large group of nations, and if they choose to enforce the judgments of this or any other court by sanctions, it is none of our affair.

In the name of God, why are we going there, then, if it is none of our affair? If the peace of the world is threatened, if sanctions are demanded by a league to enforce that peace under the decision of a court of which we are a part, tell me that it is none of our affair. Whence came that doctrine to the United States of America, and how long would the people of the United States of America tolerate that doctrine?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think that we should now withdraw from The Hague Court of Arbitration for the reasons now suggested by the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know what the Senator is talking about, Mr. President, and for that reason I do not intend to answer him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask a question in reply?

Mr. JOHNSON. Surely.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator claim that The Hague Court of Arbitration pretends to enforce its decrees by sanctions, by arms—that it has any such authority, or that it ever has undertaken to assert it?

Mr. LENROOT. It has exactly the same authority that the Permanent Court of International Justice has. The sanctions that the Senator now refers to apply specifically to all awards, and therefore they apply to the court of arbitration at The Hague; and if the argument the Senator now makes is valid we should at once withdraw from The Hague court.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no; I deny that statement, sir. I deny it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Of course they do not apply to The Hague court.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not intend to enter into a controversy with the Senator from Wisconsin on that point. I deny that the arbitration court of The Hague permits anything of the sort. It does not do anything of the kind, sir.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California further yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I will yield no further. I want to conclude. The Senator will pardon me. I do not intend any impoliteness by not yielding to him, but I am very weary, and I want to finish if I can.

I desire, Mr. President, to present to you upon this question of sanctions something that has been said by Mr. Hudson. I quote Mr. Hudson because Mr. Hudson, after all, is the outstanding character in the matter of the advocacy of the court and in the matter of the advocacy of the League of Nations.

Mr. Hudson says:

The sanctions behind the court are those contained in the covenant, and if any state should fail to abide by a decision, it will be for the council of the league (under article 13 of the covenant) to “propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.”

Now, sanctions are behind the court's decisions, according to what Mr. Hudson says. Sanctions are behind the league provisions, we all know; and that these sanctions would be employed in case decisions should be rendered and there were recalcitrant states declining to carry out those decisions seems to me a matter which can not be doubted or questioned. To say to me that The Hague tribunal has exactly the same sanctions is to say to me something that I can not for an instant believe.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I made no such statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then we do not differ. I am very glad.

Mr. LENROOT. I said the permanent court had no more sanctions than The Hague tribunal, and the Senator will not dispute that.

Mr. JOHNSON. The permanent court has no more sanctions than The Hague tribunal?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Hague tribunal has no sanctions.

Mr. LENROOT. And neither has this court.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; it has—yes; it has—yes; it has! It has the sanctions, as Mr. Hudson says, of the League of Nations behind it, and those sanctions may be starving a people or fighting a people into subjection; and when gentlemen stand here and say that if sanctions be employed it is none of our affair, I take issue with that statement. It is our affair. If we are to do aught that is of value to the world, if we seek at all the peace of humanity, to say that we will go into a court, and when war is imminent, and when it is possible that there may be strife between nations, that we will stand aside and say it is none of our affair, is to put this Nation in a position that no American ought to wish for it at all.

Mr. President, it was my intention to refer historically to much to-day and to some of the things that have gone before. I find that it is a matter of impossibility to continue at great length. I wish, however, sir, to say to our brethren upon this floor concerning what has transpired in this debate: Stop; pause for a moment; see whither you are going. Do you believe that you will stop short in this World Court when once you have entered it, and that no farther will you go? Do you imagine for a second that you can play the part that has been mapped out upon this floor for this Nation, once you enter that World Court? It is as certain as anything can be that entry into the court will take us farther along the path. If you want to go along that path, go along it; that is all right; but if you do not wish to do it, do not pretend that you are entering upon another path altogether and another scene altogether.

Mr. President, a century ago in this city this question was threshed out before the American people. A century ago in this city came the representative of the great Russian Czar. Came he for the purpose of taking the new young Republic into the Holy Alliance. Came he here with instructions to tell our people how the War of 1812 had demonstrated that no longer could America hold her position of aloofness in the world, but that any strife in the future meant that America would be involved.

I read the arguments of gentlemen upon the other side; I read those in the newspapers that are advocating this court; and I see that they are based upon the same premise, the same argument, to-day that the Russian Czar based his argument upon 100 years ago in asking us to join the Holy Alliance.

They say to us, Mr. President: "The World War has demonstrated that you must take part in world affairs. The World War has shown that no longer can there be strife on earth but that you are a party to that strife." They say to us now: "This war has demonstrated that you can not hold your position as you have held it in the past." That was said to us 100 years ago.

Oh, sirs, you upon this floor, read Doctor Cresson's little work here on The Holy Alliance and the Monroe Doctrine. Read old John Quincy Adams's words, then. Read Monroe's utterances. Read of those who were our statesmen in that day, who then mapped out the course of the American Republic that we have followed ever since.

I want to keep out of this mess, Mr. President, not because I say that we are better than the people abroad at all. I do not assert it in any aspect. We are different from those across the sea. We are different from them. Here we have a melting pot, Mr. President, that has not yet melted. Here, sir, we have different aspirations, different ideas, and different governmental policies than those people across the sea. There, between those nations, are shadowy boundaries which have been insufficient to stem the hatreds and the jealousies and the racial feuds of centuries. There, over across the sea, are united nationalities. Over here is a polyglot people. Take us over there into this court and into this league, take us across the sea into this maelstrom, and you not only have your difficulties there and your partisanship over there, but you bring upon us here the ills of the national groups that yet reside in the United States of America. It is because of that, for one reason, that I do not wish to dabble in that which we neither understand nor appreciate. It is because of that, for one reason, that I do not wish to go abroad and become a part of Europe's political life.

Can you stamp out nationalism abroad, Mr. President? Not a bit of it! You can no more stamp out patriotism abroad than, thank God, you can stamp it out in some people at home. Patriotism there means nationality. Nationality there means much to them. They believe, across the sea, in more peoples, more lands. We want neither. We covet no more peoples, we ask no more lands. They believe in imperialism. We do not. We have a set of interests different from theirs. Why leave our soil to stand upon theirs? Over there they have one common purpose. Oh, face the realities, you gentlemen here! Do you not realize what the situation is? No man who comes out of Europe to-day but understands it and will tell it to you. No secret is expressed when I say, however they may snarl at one another across the sea and however they may make faces across their shadowy boundaries, there is a common feeling with them all, a feeling of jealousy, distrust, suspicion, and hostility to the United States of America.

All over Europe that exists. You can not deny it. Whenever a creditor presses his debtor, it results. Not only does it result in this instance from that source, but it results from many, many years and from many, many incidents. A creditor nation pressing every other nation in Europe of power and of standing, and then we go into a court composed of judges from these very nations!

Nationalism you deny, in what terms you will, of this World Court. I have no disposition to say aught of ill concerning it or any man in it. Imagine the Italian judge, however, sitting upon that court, rendering a decision against Italy and Mussolini, and then going back to Italy, Mr. President! Nationalism there, sir, obtains—nationalism of a degree that perhaps we little comprehend—and nationalism will persist to the dawn of the new era.

In Europe since the war what do you observe? What is Europe since the war? What is it that has happened there? Are minorities cared for and weak nations protected? Not a bit of it, sir! A military dictator in Spain sets aside civil power. In Greece a militarist sits in power, and his own sweet will is the measure of the law for the people of that territory. In Italy there is an absolutism such as modern times never before have seen. Into this, with the representatives of some of these nations upon the court, you would take Uncle Sam, the creditor nation of the earth, and submit him to the judgment, perhaps, in some instances, of his debtors!

I have heard of men in the past who were debtors submitting themselves to the judgment of their creditors. I never yet heard of a creditor—you may say it is an impossibility, but possibilities of every sort may arise, sir—I never yet knew a creditor who submitted himself to the judgment of his debtors.

Take the United States into the court, thence into the league. I speak of going into the court and going into the league as one and the same thing, for I firmly believe that one means the other and that ultimately in the league we will find our-

selves embroiled in exactly that which we were warned against in the days of the old debate and that which we then escaped.

Mr. President, I recognize the patriotism of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. I recognize that on this question it is no less fervid than my own. I recognize that they desire the right just as I desire the right. Oh, pray with me to the God of Hosts, the God who makes the fortunes of men and settles the destinies of nations, in this hour of our need, to take the right road for the United States of America!

Here we stand at the crossroads, Mr. President. Behind us is the illumined way that we have traveled for 140 years in the past. Behind us is this illumined way, every milestone marked by the blood of patriots and the wisdom of statesmen who have gone before. Ahead of us are the beckoning hands of those who guided our country's course along the road we have traveled these 140 years, traveled to our present eminence and our present greatness under the blessing of God. Let us continue upon that road in the days and the hours ahead of us.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. President, in my judgment the sober, second thought of the American people can always be trusted. Great and important questions should never be hastily determined. It has been a little more than six years since the armistice was signed. During this period the interest in world peace has not lessened, but has increased from day to day.

The necessity for some tribunal of international justice has been accepted with increasing force since the day the armistice was signed. At this time all people in this country are interested in and discussing this question. During the last five years this subject has been intensively studied and we may now feel that calm deliberation controls our thought. This international question has received the best thought of the most able and patriotic men and women of the United States.

It is important to dispel the erroneous impressions which sometimes appear to prevail concerning the so-called World Court. There is no opposition, in fact, to the establishment of a tribunal of justice to deal with international questions and with problems which might form the basis of controversy and terminate in actual conflict between nations. The only real difference of opinion that exists relates to the kind of a world court with which our country is willing to affiliate; or, stated differently, what reservations we must impose as a condition to our joining the other nations of the world in the establishment of such a court.

It is important, therefore, to first consider the exact language of the resolution which is now pending for consideration before this body. It reads:

Whereas the President, under date of February 23, 1923, transmitted a message to the Senate accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of State, dated February 17, 1923, asking the favorable advice and consent of the Senate to the adhesion on the part of the United States to the protocol of December 18, 1920, of signature of the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, set out in the said message of the President (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction contained therein), upon the conditions and understandings hereafter stated, to be made a part of the instrument of adhesion: Therefore be it

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring), That the Senate advise and consent to the adhesion on the part of the United States to the said protocol of December 18, 1920, and the adjoined statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction contained in said statute), and that the signature of the United States be affixed to the said protocol, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and condition of this resolution, namely:

1. That such adhesion shall not be taken to involve any legal relation on the part of the United States to the League of Nations or the assumption of any obligations by the United States under the covenant of the League of Nations constituting part 1 of the treaty of Versailles.

2. That the United States shall be permitted to participate through representatives designated for the purpose and upon an equality with the other States, members, respectively, of the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations, in any and all proceedings of either the council or the assembly for the election of judges or deputy judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice or for the filling of vacancies.

3. That the United States will pay a fair share of the expenses of the court as determined and appropriated from time to time by the Congress of the United States.

4. That the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice adjoined to the protocol shall not be amended without the consent of the United States.

5. That the United States shall be in no manner bound by any advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice not

rendered pursuant to a request in which it, the United States, shall expressly join in accordance with the statute for the said court adjoined to the protocol of signature of the same to which the United States shall become signatory.

The signature of the United States to the said protocol shall not be affixed until the powers signatory to such protocol shall have indicated, through an exchange of notes, their acceptance of the foregoing reservations and understandings as a part and a condition of adhesion by the United States to the said protocol.

A world court tribunal was formally indorsed by the Republican Party at its national convention in Cleveland in 1924. The party platform provides, however, that affiliation with such a tribunal should be made only upon the conditions embodied in the following reservations:

First. That by supporting the court we do not assume any obligations under the league.

Second. That we participate upon an equality with other States in the election of judges.

Third. That the Congress shall determine what part of the expenses we shall bear.

Fourth. That the statute creating the court shall not be amended without our consent.

President Coolidge in his message to the present Congress suggested the adoption of the foregoing reservations, and as a further safeguard President Coolidge suggested the following additional condition and reservation:

That we are not to be bound by advisory opinions rendered without our consent.

As a Republican, therefore, I have the formal declaration of the party platform expressing the conditions upon which this resolution be adopted. With the declaration of my party and the suggestions of the President of the United States, elected upon that platform by a majority of 7,000,000, I am in entire harmony and accord. The additional reservation suggested by President Coolidge, in my judgment, removes any objection which might remain to the action of this Government in joining with the other civilized nations of the world in creating a world tribunal to promote peace.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] proposes the following reservations as the conditions under which the resolution before us be adopted:

First. That the league impose no new duties on the court unless the statute itself is amended and this action ratified by every power signatory to the protocol.

Second. That adherence of the United States to the statute is conditioned on the understanding that no force or economic sanction shall at any time be employed to enforce the court's decrees or opinions.

Third. That American adherence be conditioned further on the understanding that no section of the statute shall ever be construed as to require the United States to depart from its traditional policy of not entangling itself with Europe's political questions, nor shall anything in the statute be construed as to imply relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

It will be seen that there is no startling or irreconcilable conflict between the reservations suggested in the platform of the Republican Party and by President Coolidge, and those proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It is more a difference in language than in spirit. In both cases the reservations are proposed to prevent our becoming involved in entangling political alliances in Europe, and to preserve our own right to independent action against European interference in our affairs.

Our form of government compels the ultimate compromise of opinion upon mere form, in order to reach the substance, upon any great question. The differences here are more in form than substance. Yet the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is by the press often quoted as being opposed to the principle of the organization of any international tribunal to promote world peace. In that regard he is, of course, misquoted. We are all actuated by the same purpose, and are striving to attain the same ultimate end. We want to preserve our own right of independent action, and yet we are not willing to lend our moral support to any great tribunal for world peace.

For myself, I am constrained to follow the mandate of my party platform and the leadership of President Coolidge, rather than undertake to suggest in some modified language another method of reaching the same end. The platform of the Republican Party, with the additional safeguard proposed in the additional reservation suggested by President Coolidge in his annual message, which I have heretofore quoted, appeal to me as proper guidance in the discharge of my duty and the recording of my vote in this body upon the proposition of creating a tribunal to promote peace in the world.

While we must here register our personal views and convictions, yet mindful of the value of the deliberate opinion of the people of the country, expressed after due deliberation and upon sober second thought, I deem it appropriate to here call attention to the expressions of approval by various groups of our citizens, and by men recognized as safe and sound leaders of public thought. The groups and organizations that have spoken on this subject in this country may be roughly divided into three classes.

First I would mention those of a religious character as expressing the thought of various groups of religious thought. Practically every religious denomination, through their respective governing bodies, have voiced their approval in formal communications to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; all of them have urged our entrance into a world tribunal to promote peace.

The Northern Baptist Convention, which comprises a membership of about a million and a quarter people, presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs this resolution:

Resolved, That we urge the administration at Washington to effect such international agreement as shall enable us to put the strength of our wisdom and experience at the service of humanity.

The resolution further expressed approval of the efforts made by the President in urging our joining a world court.

The National Council of the Episcopal Church submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a resolution adopted by that body, the language of which is:

Be it resolved, That this council indorses the recommendation of our late President that the United States become a constituent of the World Court under the reservations suggested by him; and

Resolved further, That this council urges on all members of the church the duty of prayer for this great step for world peace, of study, and of action in its behalf.

Dr. Sidney L. Gulick presented the following memorial to the United States Senate:

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in annual meeting assembled, hereby reaffirms the action of the officers of the Federal Council in expressing to President Coolidge, on behalf of the churches, appreciation of his advocacy in his message to the Senate on December 6, 1923, of American membership in the Permanent Court of International Justice.

We warmly indorse the declarations of the late President Harding and of President Coolidge that this matter is not a partisan issue. It should not, we believe, be made one. We respectfully convey to the President and to the Senate of the United States the earnest desire of the constituency of this council that the Senate take speedy and favorable action on the recommendation of the President.

The Rev. Dr. Arthur J. Brown, as the representative of the Presbyterian Board of Missions, personally appeared before the committee in support of this measure.

Dr. Samuel A. Chester appeared, representing the Southern Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Jason Noble Pierce represented the Congregational Churches and presented their resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the National Council of Congregational Churches that our Nation should arise above political partisanship in its international relation, and that the world situation demands that America proceed at once to enter into the World Court, which was urged upon the people as a present opportunity and duty by President Harding in his last journey.

Also appeared before the committee Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, representing the Society of Friends; also Rabbi Abram Simon, representing the Central Conference of American Rabbis. These and many others, representative of the religious thought of the country, urged upon the committee favorable action upon the resolution under consideration.

Among the additional religious groups who have urged favorable action on this resolution are—

Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.
The Union Ministers' Meeting.
American Unitarian Association.
National Board of Young Women's Christian Association.
United Society for Christian Endeavor.
Baptist World Alliance.
World Christian Citizens' Conference.
International Missionary Union.
Women's Missionary Union of Friends in America.
The Methodist Episcopal Clergy Annual Conference Church Peace Union (a seminary organization).

Next I would call attention to groups which may be more properly termed secular in character. From the following

groups of this character representatives appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

The National Chamber of Commerce.
 American Federation of Labor.
 American Bar Association.
 National Association of Credit Men.
 National League of Women Voters.
 American Association of University Women.
 The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
 National Council of Women.
 World Peace Foundation.
 American Federation of Teachers.
 National Service Star Legion.
 National Council of Jewish Women.
 Girls' Friendly Society of America.
 National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers' Association.
 All Nations' Association.
 Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
 New York Council for International Cooperation to Prevent War.
 Association to Abolish War.

The foregoing are representative and typical of the solemn and considerate thought of outstanding groups among our people upon this subject.

Perhaps we may not indorse all that has been said by individual men and women or by organizations in favor of international affiliations. I, myself, can not go as far as many of our great educational leaders and representative groups have gone by way of encouragement toward affiliations that might lead to entangling alliances; I can not indorse all they have said about our entering into active participation in world affairs. Certainly I can not agree with those who would have us become involved in world politics.

However, consideration should be given to the declarations of students of history; their opinions should be received, and in so far as they give promise of practical application in our desire to provide some method of promoting peace, we may well profit by their suggestions.

Among the outstanding leaders of thought advocating a so-called world court we can mention with confidence such men as former Presidents Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, and Harding. To these I would add such men as Elihu Root and Charles E. Hughes.

Even with the support and indorsement of the men and women, and groups of men and women above enumerated, I would still be hesitant to unqualifiedly assert that the sober second thought of our people is settled in favor of this resolution.

But there exists in this country a third group of citizens, to whose voice upon this subject we have no right to turn a deaf ear; rather, we should eagerly and unhesitatingly accept their verdict as sound and of controlling importance. I refer to that group of our citizens who were willing to die for their country and who offered themselves as willing to make the supreme sacrifice to save civilization.

Four millions of the flower of our land cheerfully responded in the great crisis of the World War. These men, having experienced the horrors of war, fully realize the importance of the preservation of peace. Nobody can assert that they could be influenced by any false ideas concerning foreign entanglements. Their verdict and judgment may be most safely relied upon as purely patriotic. They are led by no false ideals; they cherish no foolish antagonisms; they simply speak from experience.

The American Legion at their convention in Omaha last October adopted a resolution urging—

the immediate adherence by the United States to a permanent court of international justice.

The Legion did not stop with this simple declaration, but by formal resolution declared:

This should be the chief objective of Legion peace activities and every influence and power of the Legion should be exerted to press the matter to a favorable vote in the United States Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Fortified, therefore, by the expressed opinion of the great religious groups in America and of the most prominent secular organizations, some of which I have before enumerated, when the American Legion, as the representative of the patriotic spirit of the country, speaking seven years after the armistice, names as the chief objective of their peace activities the use of their influence with this body to secure a favorable vote to promote peace, by the adoption of the resolution now under consideration with these essential reservations, I am moved to agreement with their sober and considerate judgment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKINLEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator claim that this resolution represents the sentiment of the American Legion? Does he not know, as a matter of fact, that Legion post after Legion post have protested against our adherence to this World Court?

Mr. McKINLEY. I do not know. I have quoted the resolution passed in their national convention.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I happen to know that.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. President, if a fear be entertained that the United States may become involved in European troubles, surely the speech delivered by our Secretary of State in New York on December 14, voicing the sentiments of President Coolidge, should dispel their misgivings. At that time he declared that it has been the settled policy of the United States not to interfere in purely European questions, and we here protect and preserve our American doctrine that the European nations shall not interfere in our affairs.

Secretary Kellogg said in the address referred to:

We shall go to the very limit of reasonable cooperation for all legitimate purposes, but we will not commit ourselves to the European system of alliances and counteralliances to maintain the balance of power upon that continent.

In conclusion, I am moved to suggest the fact that in centuries past most wars have developed from the ambitions and antagonisms of czars and emperors, whose power over their subjects enabled them to declare war. The World War has eliminated all czars and emperors, and particularly in western Europe, in the countries with which the United States is in close touch, the people are in control of their governments, and can dictate a warlike or a peaceful policy. The people in these countries are weary of war. This is evidenced particularly by their prompt acceptance of the Dawes plan and of the recently signed Locarno pact.

Europe needs our moral support. There were some of our citizens who feared the consequences of sending to the war-ridden nations of Europe the services of an unofficial commission, voluntarily tendered, to render possible aid in the solution of their economic problems. We all remember how eagerly they accepted the judgment and suggestions of this unbiased and disinterested commission from the United States. Being satisfied of our fairness and lack of prejudice, and with the sincerity of our motives to lend our moral support to the establishment of sound economic policies, the Dawes plan was promptly accepted, and is to-day acclaimed one of the triumphs of American statesmanship and diplomacy.

The Locarno pact is no theoretical proposition, but is an agreement entered into by the five great nations of Europe; those nations at this time have the ability to enforce their wishes. It should be remembered that 50 years ago there were two similar agreements, one entered into by Germany, Italy, and Austria and the other included the nations of France, England, and Russia. Austria has been dismembered and does not count; the conditions in Russia appear to be chaotic; but the other four nations who were in the agreement of 50 years ago, arrayed on opposite sides and in antagonistic groups, are now combined into an agreement to maintain world peace, and for a considerable period I think they will do so.

Just as Europe asked our moral support, which brought about the adoption of the Dawes plan, so now they are asking our moral support in the proposition for a so-called world court to promote peace.

With the Coolidge reservations, such a court of peace will involve America in no entangling alliances. In a word, to sum it all up, the World Court can do America no harm, and may do the world some good. It is not a contract, but rather a peaceful gesture. It is not an entangling alliance, but a friendly cooperation. It is just a step in the right direction.

It is the duty of America to do what it can to preserve the peace of the world. Surely no civilized people can refuse to help. If peace reigns in Europe, if business there returns to normal, if their purchasing power is regained, then our American surplus of corn, cotton, wheat, and manufactured products will find a growing market.

The World Court resolution as now proposed has been amended in every way to protect American independence in the consideration of purely American questions; in the selection of judges, in the payment of expense, in the equality of votes, in the submission of disputes, in the matter of foreign questions in which America would have no place and no interest. All these matters have been given attention.

There is nothing to fear! There is nothing to lose! And perhaps permanent world peace to gain!

From every standpoint of both cold business and warm humanitarian interest the American Republic should take its place in this new movement and this new hope for "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the human race is indebted to the great men who have worked here. The men of vision, the men who have wrought well in their day and generation are entitled to our esteem and reverence. I have in mind one of the greatest Presidents that the United States has ever had. I refer to Woodrow Wilson. Upon two occasions recently I have heard the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] attack and criticize him. At the same time he eulogized Mr. Lodge. He praised Mr. Lodge for helping to defeat the League of Nations. The Senator from South Carolina evidently did not know that Mr. Lodge favored a league of nations or a world court of some kind. In a speech made in the State of Massachusetts in 1915 Mr. Lodge used this language:

If we have reached the limit of voluntary arbitration what is the next step? I think the next step is that which this league proposes, and that is to put force behind international peace. We may not solve it in that way, but if we can not solve it in that way it can be solved in no other way.

The former Senator from Massachusetts opposed the League of Nations. He probably did more than any other one man to defeat it. The former Senator from Massachusetts changed his position entirely, as the record will show and as the debates here upon the League of Nations will show. The former Senator from Massachusetts, just three years before the League of Nations treaty was defeated, favored a league backed by force and he favored this Government being a member of such a league.

The Senator from South Carolina in his attack upon President Wilson, rather contrasting him with Mr. Lodge, praised Mr. Lodge exceedingly. I served with Senator Lodge in this body. He was a very cultured and scholarly man. He was a very cold man. He was a man who had no very warm friendships. I always had the impression, as others had, that he was exceedingly jealous of President Wilson, envious of his scholarship, of his learning, of his masterly manner of presenting questions in which he was interested, and of the intellectual superiority that people generally recognize in him over most of his fellows.

Upon a former occasion a Senator who served in this body who is not now here criticized President Wilson severely, and I stated upon the floor of the Senate at that time that I would not permit anybody to assault unjustly this great man, who could not be here to speak for himself, without replying to such an attack.

The Senator from South Carolina entered into a eulogy upon Senator Lodge while he was attacking in the same breath the martyred President of the United States. While he was praising Senator Lodge I could but think of and contrast the service of the two to the South, to the section from which the Senator from South Carolina hails. One of them, the Senator from Massachusetts, when a Member of the House, introduced a bill known as the force bill. The greatest filibuster in the history of this body was conducted to defeat that bill, and succeeded in doing so. If that bill had been enacted into law, soldiers would have gone to every polling place in the South—in South Carolina, in Alabama. At all the voting precincts in the South they would have stood with their bayonets and they would have controlled the elections by force. They would have permitted negroes, drunk on their new-found freedom and led on by scalawags and carpetbaggers, to have overthrown the civilization of the South. All that was dear to us was at stake. And yet the Senator from South Carolina has eulogized Mr. Lodge as one of the greatest Americans and has criticized and condemned President Wilson.

What did President Wilson do for the South? Born in Virginia, in the first place, he placed in his Cabinet four southern men when he was President. He did all that he could to relieve that people, not yet recovered entirely from the evil effects of the war of 1860 and the reign of the carpetbagger and the scalawag, always encouraging and trying to help us up and relieve us of the burdens that long rested upon us. I was utterly astounded at the speech of the Senator from South Carolina when he attacked this great man and eulogized the man who undertook during his service at this Capital, by one of the most dangerous outstanding acts in his career, to wipe out and destroy the Anglo-Saxon civilization of the South.

I refer to these things because they are matters of record, and I want the record to remain straight. The Senator from South Carolina is entitled to his opinion about President

Wilson, but when he comes into this body and undertakes to express that opinion somebody is going to reply to him, if I have to do it myself.

In contrast with what this Senator, who claims to be a Democrat from South Carolina, has said about Mr. Wilson, I want to read what the present President of the United States said about this great man when he went to his last sleep:

As President of the United States he was moved by an earnest desire to promote the best interests of the country as he conceived them. His acts were prompted by high motives and his sincerity of purpose can not be questioned. He led the Nation through the terrific struggle of the World War with a lofty idealism which never failed him. He gave utterance to the aspirations of humanity with an eloquence which held the attention of all the earth and made America a new and enlarged influence in the destiny of mankind.

I submit that statement against the attacks of the Senator from South Carolina. That statement was made by Calvin Coolidge.

I hold in my hand the address delivered at the memorial exercises in the House by Doctor Alderman, of Virginia, another southerner. I prefer to quote him and to read what he has to say than to listen to the attacks of the Senator from South Carolina upon this great man. He quoted President Wilson:

What a man ought never to forget with regard to a college—

He once said at Swarthmore—

is that it is a nursery of honor and principle.

Then he said of President Wilson when president of Princeton:

He inaugurated new principles of educational contact, which now lie at the core of the development, not alone of his own university but of all the institutions of liberal culture in his country.

It seems that this man of very high culture and broad learning differs very much with the Senator from South Carolina in his opinion of this great scholar and statesman. Proceeding in his speech Doctor Alderman said:

Woodrow Wilson had the impulse to write as well as to talk and became a writer of eminence fit to claim a place in the literature of his country along with Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and Roosevelt.

Does a man of that character deserve the attack made upon him which was made by the Senator from South Carolina? Doctor Alderman quotes Mr. Wilson again. Mr. Wilson said:

It is not knowledge that moves the world, but ideals, convictions, the opinions or fancies that have been held or followed; and whoever studies humanity ought to study it alive, practice the vivisection of reading literature, and acquaint himself with something more than anatomies which are no longer in use by spirits.

I commend that to the Senators who are harking back to things of a hundred years ago and more, and who seem to have no vision of the present, or of the things that are to come. Again, Doctor Alderman compliments Mr. Wilson:

I can not, at this time and place, attempt even to enumerate the legislative measures which, under his leadership, went forward in the Sixty-third Congress; but I venture to claim that no such well thought out program of financial, social, and industrial reform, no such inspiring spectacle of governmental efficiency and concentrated energy, no such display of fearless devotion to public interests, moving high above the plane of partisan advantage or of private gain, has been spread before the eyes of this generation as is afforded by the list of enduring enactments which crowned the accession to power of Woodrow Wilson.

There is quite a difference of opinion between these two distinguished southerners. Referring to Mr. Wilson, at about the time when the war was nearing the close, Doctor Alderman said:

Still preoccupied with the thought of lasting peace, Mr. Wilson appeared before the Congress in the early winter of 1918, at the darkest moment of the allied fortunes, and formulated 14 points of peace. These generalizations were almost revolutionary in their scope and idealism and ultimately formed the general basis of the peace to be drafted; but they carried, too, a political adroitness aiming directly at putting an end to the fighting. They planted new seeds of aspiration and new hopes of justice between nations in the minds of men; and it is not easy to ostracize such ideas. Its timeliness, as well as its strength, gives to this document a place among the great charters which have marked the progress of mankind.

I commend these statements to the Senator from South Carolina.

This paper, and the complimentary addresses following it, aimed at nothing less than to endow the broken and weary nations with a new order and a new life. Desperate peoples for an hour looked into the shining face of Hope, and had sight of an old heaven and a new earth arising out of horror but ennobled by the self-sacrifice of millions. In Burke's vivid phrase, he was now the Lord of the Ascendant; his speeches had the strength of battalions along the front of battle; his voice was the voice of free peoples; and all over the earth, in the great capitals, among the tribes of the desert, in the islands of the sea, men felt the molding of his thought and sensed the grandeur of his aims.

I submit that a man of that character should not be attacked by anybody in this body, much less by one who hails from the section of the country that gave Mr. Wilson birth. Doctor Alderman goes on to say:

The genius of the Army and Navy displayed itself in war. The genius of the President struck down the enemy morale and laid the foundations of peace.

That is literally true, Mr. President, as all of us who knew this man and knew what he was doing during the war know. Doctor Alderman refers here to language used by President Roosevelt:

In 1910, in his Nobel lecture, Theodore Roosevelt himself said:

"It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace not only to keep the peace among themselves but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The man or statesman who should bring about such a condition would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind."

The then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, favored such a course as Mr. Wilson was pursuing; Mr. Roosevelt favored such a course; he pointed it out before Mr. Wilson became President, and told how the world should be grateful to a man who would lead the way to universal peace; but the Senator from South Carolina criticizes and condemns President Wilson for trying to bring about universal peace. Again Doctor Alderman says, referring to Mr. Wilson's tour of the West, when the League of Nations was before the Senate for consideration:

There is no series of political speeches, made under circumstances of such strain, in our annals attaining a higher level of oratory and exposition. He was forewarned, as he fared forth, that his life might be the forfeit of his enterprise. He replied, "I would forfeit my life to attain the end I seek," and he meant it; for he was incapable of melodramatic pose, and the consecration of that statement runs like a thread of gold through the sustained appeal.

Mr. President, that statement is not overdrawn. President Wilson was a man of that character, of that heroic mold that if he believed in anything that affected mankind he believed in it so strongly that he would be willing to die for his convictions. That is more than I can say of a good many public men that I have known in my day and generation. Doctor Alderman continues:

Woodrow Wilson fell stricken as if in battle at Pueblo, Colo., on September 25, 1919, and came home shorn of his unmatched strength to persuade and move the hearts of his countrymen.

The last words spoken to the people at Pueblo by the President were these: "Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice, liberty, and peace. We have accepted that truth, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world out into pastures of quietness and peace such as this world never dreamed of before."

What a glorious vision, Mr. President, for any man, be he Republican or Democrat, who is striving for the day when out of the clash of arms and the iron storm of war shall come peace universal! But this man is criticized by the Senator from South Carolina because of his activities even in the World War and especially because of his activities to clinch the result of the World War, and after helping to put war down to provide some way to keep war down.

Doctor Alderman continues:

Posterity will be eager to have knowledge of the personality and the salient qualities of a statesman set apart to play such a rôle in the world's affairs. I shall picture him as I knew him—not the Wilson whom mankind will remember as the stern war leader of a mighty nation, but another Wilson, known to me—a Wilson of sprightliness and humor and handsome courtesy, of kindly countenance and fascinating conversation, with power to "beguile you into being informed beyond your worth and wise beyond your birthright."

I commend that to my friend from South Carolina.

Woodrow Wilson was a deeply religious man. Men who do not understand the religious spirit need not even try to understand him.

I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina was in mind when that sentence was uttered.

No man in supreme power in any nation's life, since Gladstone, was so profoundly penetrated by the Christian faith. He was sturdily and mystically Christian. He took God Almighty in earnest as the Supreme Reality, and he carried Him into his home and saw His immanence and guidance in private and public life. He had the habit of prayer, and he read and reread the English Bible. Through all his speeches flamed the glory of an insistent belief that morality and politics should march hand in hand. Many of his tendencies, perhaps the most of them that occasioned debate and censure, sprang from his pragmatic belief in God.

Wilson could be, and sometimes was, aloof and unrelenting to this or that friend or foe; but mankind, in the mass, never failed to soften his spirit and awaken his emotions. He would have gone to the stake to protect mankind, as a whole, from tyranny and injustice.

Mr. President, he served his day and generation well, but he is gone. Dead because of the fight that he made to promote peace and prevent war. I do not intend that anybody shall assail him so long as I am a Member of this body without rising and saying something in his behalf. Not that he needs any defense from me or from anyone else, but I just want the people who read the RECORD which goes out of this body to see that we reverence and love Woodrow Wilson here. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], a Republican, the very day before the Senator from South Carolina attacked him, paid him a tribute in this body. I wanted the RECORD to show just what the situation is here as to the regard in which the memory of Woodrow Wilson is held.

Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] made a very strong speech for his side of this proposition. If he understands this question, and if he has properly presented it, there is nothing to the position of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. The Senator from Idaho has argued here for hours that this court can drag us in and take jurisdiction over us, and the Senator from California holds that the court has no power to take us in or to exercise jurisdiction over us unless we consent. That is my position, so the Senator from California and I are agreed. It is simply a place where nations can go who want to arbitrate their differences. One side can go to it and ask to have a matter arbitrated, and the court would simply say, "Is the other side willing?" "I do not think so." "Then we have no jurisdiction over the matter."

Did you ever hear of a case being arbitrated in a community—and they are being arbitrated throughout the country to-day by the hundreds and the thousands—except where both parties agreed to it? Certainly not. Both sides come up to the arbitration board agreed on, and both sides agree to submit their cause, and to be bound by the judgment that is rendered. We are doing that in common practice throughout the United States to-day, and have done it since we have been in existence as a nation. Are we quarreling with the World Court because it is putting into practice things that we originated, that we have had in practice here since the Government was organized?

"Well, but," they say, "it is not any account, then, if it has no power." Mr. President, it is. Any place created and kept in existence to watch the operations of the nations of the earth, to watch nations contriving to start a war that will involve, perhaps, the whole world, to cry out against it, to cause publicity to be given and let the world begin to use its influence, not after they are out fighting but before hostilities begin, in order to prevent fighting, is a mighty good international institution to have.

The Senator from California described how Democrats would laugh when they got this thing over. Why, this World Court is not altogether what I want. I am frank to say that I am not entirely satisfied with it; but it is the only thing that is submitted to us. It is the best thing in sight, and a Republican President has recommended it in three of his messages.

I want to read to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] what Mr. Coolidge, the Republican President, says:

Our foreign policy has always been guided by two principles. The one is the avoidance of permanent political alliances which would sacrifice our proper independence. The other is the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations. By example and by treaty we have advocated arbitration. For nearly 25 years we have been a

member of The Hague Tribunal, and have long sought the creation of a permanent world court of justice. I am in full accord with both of these policies.

That is what President Coolidge said in 1923. Here is what he said in 1924. He is still following that up. He is the President of the party of the Senator from California:

America has been one of the foremost nations in advocating tribunals for the settlement of international disputes of a justiciable character. Our representatives took a leading part in those conferences which resulted in the establishment of The Hague tribunal and later in providing for a Permanent Court of International Justice. I believe it would be for the advantage of this country and helpful to the stability of other nations for us to adhere to the protocol establishing that court upon the conditions stated in the recommendation which is now before the Senate, and further, that our country shall not be bound by advisory opinions which may be rendered by the court upon questions which we have not voluntarily submitted for its judgment. This court would provide a practical and convenient tribunal before which we could go voluntarily, but to which we could not be summoned, for a determination of justiciable questions when they fall to be resolved by diplomatic negotiations.

Mr. President, I have to take a choice here between the Senator from California and the gentleman selected by the whole people of the United States to be President of my country. He is charged as Chief Executive with the responsibility of looking after the affairs of the Government, and while he belongs to another party he is President of the United States, and he has certainly informed himself upon this great question. He comes here and says that this is the kind of a court he wants, and the Senator from California says that what the President says about the court is true; that they can not bring us to it, but that we can go to it if we so desire.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Would the Senator be willing to go into the court if he were convinced that it did have a jurisdiction to decide cases which concerned the United States, and to do so without our consent?

Mr. HEFLIN. I would vote for a reservation to prevent that, and I am going to do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; but the question is this: The Senator states that he is for the court because it has no jurisdiction except that to which we voluntarily assent. I am asking the Senator if he would be willing to go into the court if he were convinced that the court does have or can obtain a jurisdiction to decide cases which concern the United States, and to do so without our consent?

Mr. HEFLIN. I hold that the court can not do that now; but I am going to vote for a reservation offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], which will be adopted, which specifically provides that this court shall have no jurisdiction over any case in which the United States is interested unless this Government consents that it may do so. Furthermore, it was agreed yesterday in debate, as I understood the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that at any time that this court violates the spirit of our entrance into it the Congress can pass an act withdrawing from it. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; I do not agree to it unless we make it part of the very terms of our entrance. That, however, is not the question I am trying to get my friend to answer; and I am asking this question in no captious way, as he certainly knows.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand. I have already answered the question in my own way.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not think the Senator has quite answered it. If the Senator were convinced that notwithstanding the reservations which may be adopted the court nevertheless can obtain a jurisdiction which will enable it without our consent to decide questions of importance to the United States would he be willing that the United States should then take membership upon the court?

Mr. HEFLIN. I deny that the court ever can have such authority. This court can not have any authority over us except the authority that we give it, so the Senator's question does not fit the situation at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If the Senator will do me the favor of listening when I reach that part of my address—

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not think I will ask him to listen to all of it; but if he will listen to that part of it, I think I can absolutely demonstrate that the court as consti-

tuted has a jurisdiction to decide questions of vital importance to the United States without the United States being a party and without the United States consenting.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. In that case it can do it whether we adhere or do not adhere, can it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Technically, yes; but if we sit on the court and take part in its deliberations, and recognize it, we are in a very different situation than if we sit outside of it and say that it is what it in fact is—merely a foreign tribunal set up by foreign nations. Then we will be in a very different situation.

Mr. CARAWAY. If we go into the court with an express reservation that it shall have no jurisdiction to determine any question in which we are interested without our consent, does the Senator think that will leave us more prejudiced by its decision than if it should decide when we are out of the court?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think unquestionably so.

Mr. CARAWAY. In what way?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Because if we go into this court, and recognize it as having authority—

Mr. CARAWAY. We can not destroy it by simply staying out.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; but we can ignore it by staying out.

Mr. CARAWAY. It will have the same—

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator does not let me answer.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak very long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. I think perhaps the colloquy has gone far enough.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for just a suggestion?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just a suggestion.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator from Alabama, and for my own enlightenment, that I should like to know whether the Senator from Missouri contemplated including within his question matters of domestic concern, so recognized by nations? May I say to the Senator that there are many Americans who believe in a court that has compulsory jurisdiction, excepting, of course, questions of a domestic character. Speaking for myself, I should like to see an international court that had compulsory jurisdiction to handle and decide international questions, but, of course, never to infringe domestic questions which belong to the states themselves.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator indulge me long enough to ask my friend—

Mr. KING. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I simply wish to ask my friend if he is willing to have an international court with the jurisdiction to decide all international questions and enforce its decisions?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will indulge me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I believe in an international court such as was envisaged in the discussions of The Hague conferences. I am in favor of an international court created by treaty, with jurisdiction clearly defined and before which a state may be required to appear upon complaint of another member of the court, in order that a controversy of an international character may be considered and adjudicated. I do not object to what is called compulsory jurisdiction with respect to international questions. Nor am I now referring to the present court, although I do not mean to infer that it is not an international court; and, of course, I do not mean that domestic questions should be taken cognizance of by the World Court or any international tribunal.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me once more?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand the Senator, then, to say that he is in favor of a court that can summon before it

the nations of the earth and can take jurisdiction of international disputes. Is the Senator willing, then, that that court shall be empowered to enforce its decrees?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I can not yield to a Senator to ask another Senator a question and then to answer him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield further.

Mr. HEFLIN. I should be glad to hear my good friend from Missouri ask these questions and to hear my good friend from Utah answer them; but I do not intend to talk very much longer, and I want to hear what the Senator from Missouri has to say, because I think I will make a speech on this subject before the vote is taken. I am just touching now on some things that need clearing up.

Senators who oppose the World Court talk about propaganda. The documents I have received against the World Court cost more money to send out than those I have received in favor of it. Some of them are great big pamphlets, costing, I am sure, hundreds of thousands of dollars to print. They have flooded the Capitol with them. Who is back of that propaganda and who are the men here supporting the World Court? I do not mean to say that the gentlemen who are opposing it are not just as clever and as honest and as conscientious as we are, but there is no partisanship in this fight, so far as I can see. There is none in it with me. I am willing to take the suggestion of a Republican President and to go along with Republican Senators if I can by so doing get closer to world peace.

I am weary of a situation where Senators who stood here in the other fight and fought to the death the League of Nations, a Democratic proposal, and who intimated in those days that if they could get up some other plan they would do what they could for peace, now, when a Republican comes along with a mild-mannered proposition called the World Court, find fault with that, and go to beating that about, but have not a single suggestion to offer in the place of either one of them.

That is not constructive statesmanship. They remind me of the two Dagoes going up the street. They met a man who asked them where the macaroni factory was, and they told him they did not know. They walked about two blocks, when one of them said to the other one, "He does not want the macaroni factory. He means noodle factory." The other one said "Sure." They said, "Let's go back and overtake him." They followed him four blocks back and overtook him, and said, "You did not mean macaroni factory. You meant noodle factory." He said, "That's right, I did." They said, "Well, we don't know where that is, either." [Laughter.]

That is the situation we find here. It is easy to get up here and go to pounding around and beating on something. But what have they to offer in its stead? Do not Senators think that foreign nations are sincerely striving for world peace?

There are yet to be seen widows and orphans in the war-stricken countries. There is still suffering over there because of the war. Senators say those nations are not after anything except to get the United States in.

Talk about propaganda! The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] said that he had gotten letters from children. God knows they have as much right to demand that war be stopped as anybody, and maybe more. Some of them in this country miss their fathers now, fathers killed on the battle field in France. Why have they not a right to appeal? Why should not a little child, who is told that its father will never come back, that its father died in battle, was killed in the war, appeal to Senators? Such a child ought to hate war as long as he or she lives. The opponents of this court make light of the fact that these children in 300,000 homes should write to Senators and ask them to help prevent war. They laugh at it.

The Washington Post had a cartoon some time ago showing a little girl writing a note to a Senator asking him to please vote for a World Court, the cartoon making fun of it. Christ said:

Suffer little children to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

He said at another time:

A little child shall lead them.

I suggest to the Senator from California and to other Senators that it would be well to let these little children lead them into the paths of peace.

The Senator from California said, quoting Madison, I believe, "Who serves his country best serves his party best." I sincerely believe that I am working to the highest and best interests of every man, woman, and child in my country, including the Senators who oppose this World Court, when

I stand here and work for an international tribunal to promote peace and prevent war.

Mistakes have been made by public men in the past. Patrick Henry, one of the ablest men the country ever produced, one of the honored oratorical landmarks of the Republic, his speeches spoken in every schoolhouse in the country, one of the most brilliant orators of colonial days, stood up in the convention and fought the Constitution, and he predicted that dire disaster would come if we ever had a general Government and ever adopted that Constitution. He was mistaken; that is all. His vision was not good in that particular. He was sincere in what he was doing, but he was attacking what Gladstone said was the greatest civic document ever emanating from the brain of man. It is now the Constitution, the organic structure of the greatest Government on the globe, written by Mr. Madison, of Virginia.

These Senators who are attacking the World Court, and who are telling us what dire things will follow, are just as much mistaken as Patrick Henry was. They no doubt are conscientious in their positions, but they are wrong. They are unnecessarily alarmed. They were against the League of Nations, and they are against anything that looks in the direction of international peace.

How long would we wait to establish some international tribunal for peace if we should wait for the Senators who are fighting the World Court, and who fought the League of Nations, to come in here with a proposition? We would not have it.

Implements of war have become so dangerous and deadly, something has to be done to prevent war in the future. I will not go into that phase of the matter now, because I do not intend to delay the Senate long. Some one has made the point that we are going to try to set up a world court over the Supreme Court of the United States. That is not my purpose, and I do not think it is the purpose of anybody who is going to vote for the World Court. There is no such provision in this resolution. The World Court can not exercise jurisdiction over affairs that belong to the domestic concerns of this country. Not a single domestic question can be considered by that court, and no international question where we are interested can be considered by that court, unless this Government, by specific action, authorizes the court to take up the question and consider it. Senators, if that is true, what danger is there in our going in?

I hold to the other proposition, and I do not think anybody will gainsay it, that if the World Court should undertake to take jurisdiction over cases when we did not agree they should take such jurisdiction, against the reservations we put on this proposition, the Congress of the United States could pass an act withdrawing us from the court. Everybody conceded that here yesterday, and whether it is conceded or not, I announce it as a fact. There is no way to keep this country from withdrawing from the court if it wants to do so.

I want to say to those Senators who are such alarmists that the people over there, members of the court, would rather see this country in it than to see any other country in it, because they know we are a big, powerful country and that we are not after conquest; that we love peace, and that we are not a military people. They know that we want to promote peace and not war. So they would be glad to have us in, to have our influence work with that of those who really love peace and want to prevent war in the future. So, Mr. President, there is every argument in favor of us going in and no sound argument against our taking such a course.

I shall conclude with this statement: This country has been confronted with a proposition to do something to promote peace and prevent war since our boys ended the World War in victory. Throughout the Nation various societies and churches have passed resolutions indorsing some plan or other to promote peace in the world and to prevent war. I dare say that in nearly every county in the United States some club, some organization of men, women, and children, and Christian organizations throughout the country have been asking us all along to do something. This is 1926, and the war ended in 1918. Eight years have come and gone, and nothing has been done, and here we are about to get together on something that will unite the forces in this body, setting up a tribunal looking toward preventing war and promoting peace, and we find our same friends who fought the league fighting this, the same ones who fight any proposition of an international character crying out against it and offering nothing.

Suppose this is defeated. Of course, it will not be, but what would we have if it were? Nothing. Who would rejoice if the news should go out from the Capitol that it was defeated? The gun and ammunition makers of the United States and the battleship builders. Talk about propaganda! They are the

gentlemen back of the propaganda. I do not charge that Senators on the other side know about that; they are innocent of so many things. But, Mr. President, who makes money out of war? The gun and ammunition makers make their millions and hundreds of millions. The battleship builders are the first called upon in the event of war. They get busy as soon as the tocsin of war is sounded. They do not want any tribunal to prevent war. But they dare not show their heads in opposition to it. They are away back yonder behind the screen, but they touch the button and the propaganda gets in its work. They know that if they dared come out in the open and oppose it, it would defeat their scheme. They come out here charging that we want to put something over on our country.

Would the President want to tie his country up in a dangerous foreign machine? Would two-thirds of the Members of this body deliberately tie their country up in something that was dangerous and deadly? Would three-fourths of the people of the United States—and they are back of this movement—deliberately petition us to vote for this World Court if they thought it meant ruin to their country?

Mr. President, the proposition is utterly ridiculous. The people want some sort of a peace tribunal set up, and we ought to set one up. This is the only chance we have to help along such a tribunal. Let us put reservations on the resolution if it is not sufficient to guard our interests, and we will stand on our reservations. I dare say that when 25 years shall have passed, if we are still on the stage of action, and I ask these Senators, "What about those dire predictions they made?" they will just say, "Well, we were mistaken." And that will be true. There will be a number of international matters that we would want to submit to an international court. We have long advocated the establishment of such a court. Do we propose to draw ourselves off into a shell and say, "We are not going to have anything to do with the world?" We are an exporting people. We send our produce to the markets of the earth. We want to increase our trade. We want peaceful and cordial relations with other nations.

Mr. President, when our country takes her seat in the World Court, America will be there using her great influence to promote peace throughout the world.

Mr. REED of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Frazier	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.
Bingham	George	McKellar	Sackett
Bratton	Gillett	McMaster	Schall
Brookhart	Goff	McNary	Sheppard
Bruce	Hale	Mayfield	Shipstead
Butler	Harrell	Means	Simmons
Capper	Harris	Moses	Smith
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Smoot
Copeland	Heflin	Norris	Stanfield
Couzens	Howell	Nye	Stephens
Curtis	Johnson	Oddie	Trammell
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Wadsworth
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Walsh
Fernald	Kendrick	Ransdell	Warren
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Fess	King	Reed, Pa.	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Wills

Mr. SMITH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are engaged at a meeting of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. My colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON], is necessarily detained from the Senate on business. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. COPELAND. I was requested to announce that the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is necessarily detained from the Senate on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the debate has proceeded to considerable length and has taken a wide range. There is scarcely a vagary of the imagination which has not been exploited on the floor of the Senate. Among other questions that have been thrust forward and dwelt upon with tearful insistence are the horrors of war. Those who thus speak blandly assume that is the whole question in the debate and assert that the proposed court or our entrance into it will terminate war and end all human misery. Of course, if that were true, everybody would be for the court. But the question we are to determine is not whether war is horrible, for that everybody knows and we need no insistence to convince

us. Of course, every decent human being would like to see the battle flags furled forever.

But it remains to be determined whether the proposition now before us makes for war or makes for peace; whether, if we should enter the court, we will have more of peace or more of war; whether the United States, by abandoning its ancient policies which kept us at peace with the outside world for more than a century of time, will gain more of peace for herself by remaining aloof from the controversies of Europe and Asia, or whether she will gain more of peace by entering into every controversy of the world and sticking her nose into every dispute of humanity; and likewise whether we will gain more of national dignity, national honor, and national progress by signing a compact or entering into an organization which proposes to permit all of the rest of the world to interfere in American affairs.

So those who have tears may retire and shed them in privacy—tears for war, tears for widows and orphans. That is not the question here, save in the sense that if it can be demonstrated that the United States can safely enter the court without impairment of her dignity and without impairment of her sovereignty and without danger to herself, then the World Court ought to be entered.

If, upon the other hand, however, entrance to the World Court means the entrance of the United States into the disputes of the world and the sending of our young men and our young women to die in foreign lands in the embroilments and battles of foreign countries, then, certainly, we ought to remain out of the court. That is the question.

Moreover, we have been told in the last few minutes that three-fourths of the American people demand our entrance into this court. I assert that nine-tenths of the American people know substantially nothing regarding the proposed court and that nobody has any authority to speak for three-fourths of them or for one-fourth of them or for one-tenth of them. I assert that it is probably true that there are some Senators on this floor who have never read the protocol and statute of the court. I assert that there never has been any public exposition of that statute and of that protocol in such manner as to enable the American people to have a decent opportunity to understand either of them.

To begin with, the problem presented is so intricate as to require a study by the best of lawyers of days and even weeks before the responsibility which we assume can be grasped and understood. I assert that it is fair to say that there have been millions of money expended in working up an apparent sentiment in favor of entering the court, and that probably 999 out of every 1,000 who have signed the petitions in its favor know nothing whatever regarding the real organization, power, and jurisdiction of the court.

When I asked in a resolution the privilege of an investigation so that we could trace this propaganda to its source and develop the financial and other interests back of it, the proponents of the court fled from that investigation and denied it, every single proponent of the court, so far as I know, voting against such an exposition.

We are told that this question has been before the people for a long time. In a technical sense that is true; in a practical sense it is absolutely false. Two or three years ago we began discussing some sort of world court proposal. President Harding sent to the Senate such a proposition. It went to the committee, and it was generally and commonly understood that it had gone into cold storage. It was not discussed on this floor; it was not generally discussed in the country. President Harding, however, proposed at least in one of his speeches, if not in his messages, that a most radical change should be made. What was that change? He said that the court must be entirely divorced from the league, and that in order that it should be divorced from the league the court members then existing should have the right to elect their successors, and those in turn to elect their successors; in other words, he proposed a self-perpetuating judicial oligarchy as undemocratic, as despotic, as infamous as was ever dreamed of in the brain of any man now living or in the brain of any man who is dead.

Following that, President Coolidge indorsed publicly all of the policies of President Harding, specifically stating he was going to carry them out, thus committing himself to this same proposition that the judges of the court then sitting should elect their successors, and those in turn their successors, and so on forever. That was the kind of thing that the people thought was pending here. So far as I was concerned, I was confident that such a proposition would never receive the serious attention of this body or of the American people.

Moreover, we had two elections involving the question of our entrance into the League of Nations. The decision of the people in those two elections was an utter condemnation of the

doctrine of internationalism, for that is the new doctrine with which we are now confronted. So while it is technically true that the so-called World Court proposition has been lying here in the Senate, it is not true that there has been any such discussion carried on for such a length of time as to enlighten the general public of America. I, therefore, say that any attempt to cut off this debate, to shorten the full right of discussion in the Senate, if carried out, will be an attempt at gag rule that will react most disastrously upon its authors and most unfortunately for the country.

Mr. President, who has carried on this propaganda? Every great international banker who was for our entrance into the League of Nations is for it. Every man who has loaned money abroad and would like to have his foreign bonds, which he purchased at an enormous discount, underwritten in the blood and tears of America, is for it. Every foreign influence is for it. Nearly every individual who was for the League of Nations is for it; and the Republicans who were against the League of Nations are now for it because a Republican President is for it. One of the strangest baskets of eggs that ever was carried to market is the one in which the Republican opponents of the League of Nations and Democratic proponents of the League of Nations, including my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], are all basked together and being carried to market by the hand of Calvin Coolidge. [Laughter.] And one of the strangest sounds ever made in this Chamber, where there have been many strange noises, was that made by the Senator from Alabama when he declared that Calvin Coolidge had said certain things and, therefore, he accepted them as true. [Laughter.]

I have the greatest respect for Mr. Coolidge; but his opinion carries no more weight with me since he happened to be elected President on a national platform which was opposed to internationalism than it carried before he was elected President. There is not a man in this body who would have hesitated an instant to have differed from the opinion of Calvin Coolidge in private life. So his assurance that this adventure is safe carries no more weight with me than his assurance that we ought to take all of the taxes off the great fortunes and leave them on the small fortunes and the poorer people carries weight with me. I want some higher authority.

Mr. President, with these preliminary remarks, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate at some length to the organization which it is proposed we shall enter. I wish, if possible, to get out of the clouds and down to the question before us. I wish to extricate myself from that nebulous belt in which so many of my good friends love to dwell, and which they commonly describe as a sort of millennial period, all of which they promise us is going to come if we will enter this World Court.

Mr. President, one of two propositions is true: This court either has a jurisdiction or it does not have a jurisdiction. A court with jurisdiction may be dangerous, and that danger is to be measured by the degree of its jurisdiction. A court without jurisdiction is of as little use in the economy of life as a bad breath or a white swelling. A court without jurisdiction is a court without power. A court without power is a vacuum; and when men are driven in defense of this proposition to the claim that the court has no power, they are driven to the contention that we propose a cipher and tell us that that cipher represents value.

A court is already set up, and it is said that we will not go into it unless we attach a lot of reservations. If this court is the court of the millenium, if it is going to usher in that day on which my good friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] continually dwells, when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together and a little child shall lead them—and he wants us all to follow the little child, so why not resign your seat and send here some little girl about 8 years old to do the legislating?—if this court will produce such results as are predicted by these overenthusiastic advocates, then why not join it without reservations? Why put hobbles on the millennium? Why stay the march of progress? Why do you not join the grand procession? Why do you not unite your hosannas with those of the multitude? Why do you not proceed with it to this holy of holies, where all is good and sweet communion of the saints is enjoyed? Why do you say, "Here is the sanctuary where virtue dwells and goodness makes its home, but I am not going in through the door. I am going to crawl halfway over the transom. I am going to be half in and half out. I do not want to be entirely sanctified. I just want to get my head inside the transom, so that I can back out of this sacred place as soon as it gets dangerous"?

Why, Senators, when you propose to make reservations to this court protocol and statute you certify your heart's belief that there is danger lurking there. When you say you will submit to no jurisdiction unless you consent in that particular case,

you certify that you fear the decisions of the court. When you say that you will reserve the right to stay out on every question that you do not want to submit, you certify that the court is a doubtful court and that it might exercise its jurisdiction in such manner as to imperil the rights and liberties of your country. So you fear it while you enter it. So you say to all the world: "We discredit this court in advance; we doubt it; we fear it"; and any denial of that statement is not an honest denial.

Let us see what is in this Pandora's box. Let us take the time to analyze it. Let us understand whether it is something or nothing. Let us understand whether it is to have a jurisdiction or no jurisdiction.

Let us understand one thing further: We can not treat these questions from the standpoint that this tribunal which is to be set up is to be a court of justice, for a court that has jurisdiction to do justice also has jurisdiction to do injustice. The power to decide a question at all is the power to decide it either right or wrong. So there is no guaranty that this court will act in favor of world peace. There is no guaranty, and can be none, that its decisions may not ultimately be written in blood. There is no guaranty that its jurisdiction may not be so exercised as to forge chains for a world and destroy the aspirations of all men who seek to enlarge their liberties.

Somebody—some Senator, I think, but he did not send me his name—sent over a note, and it contains these questions:

Could we have had our independence from England if the league had existed, and the question had been submitted to a world court like the one you were speaking of?

Could we have been free to have annexed Texas and brought that vast and splendid domain within the jurisdiction of a free Nation had this court, or one like it, existed?

May Canada now assert her desire for liberty and become free, and hope to do so with the existence of the league and under the decision of this court?

Could we have emancipated Cuba had we been within the jurisdiction of the court, and compelled to submit to the decision of the court?

And to these questions which I now ask there could be added a large number of other questions of similar import.

Mr. President, I say again, let us look into the structure of this court.

There is no such thing as a world court. There is an organization which may be identified by the name "The league court." It was provided for in the league compact. It was created by the league pursuant to that compact. Its members are selected by the league or the league members. The rules and regulations governing the court emanate from the league. It can be abolished by the league. Its membership can be changed by the league. It is a foreign tribunal, pure and simple, created, dominated, and controlled solely by foreign nations.

The United States is not a member of the league, and had no voice in the creation of the court. The United States has no voice in the selection of any of the successors of the so-called judges of the court. The United States had no part in enacting the rules or regulations of the court. There is no law governing the court except the will of its members and the mandates of the League of Nations.

The proposition, therefore, is that the United States shall agree to submit its controversies with foreign nations to a tribunal created by foreign nations and composed of the delegates of foreign nations, and in which the United States has no adequate assurance either of membership or of voice. That is internationalism, and it is a miserable kind of internationalism.

One hundred and fifty years ago the Revolutionists fought to establish the complete independence and sovereignty of these United States. They declared they would brook no interference by any power on earth; that the sovereign citizens of the United States should alone enact the laws and control the policies of this Republic. They declared for an absolute divorce from the monarchies of Europe. They obtained that divorce at Yorktown, when the British Empire was compelled to lower its flag. A little later they declared the dominance of the Republic upon the Western Hemisphere, and warned foreign nations against further aggression on this side of the sea; and at the same time James Monroe declared that the United States would not tolerate interference by European powers in this hemisphere. He further declared that we would not seek to obtrude ourselves into European controversies, and when we do obtrude ourselves into European controversies we repeal or nullify the first article of the Monroe doctrine.

For a century and a half the American Republic has acknowledged two slogans:

Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain.

Millions for defense, and not a penny for tribute.

Accordingly, we have hitherto steadfastly clung to the doctrines that the sons and daughters of America would for themselves determine the policies of the Nation, and that foreign influence and foreign dictation should be rejected as intolerable.

From whence emanates the sinister argument that we should substitute for these heroic doctrines a policy looking to a pusillanimous surrender of the rights of the American Nation to the judgment or rights of foreign powers? Who are these who would place above the American flag the bastard banner of internationalism? Who preaches this doctrine? From what poisoned fountain does it emanate? What selfish interests are to be served? What forces are these which propose to rush us into the league court without time for consideration by the American people, as a gold-brick man seeks to rush a prospective victim into a hasty and disastrous bargain? How many people of the United States know what the league court is? When has it been analyzed generally before the American people?

Who are the men to whom the propagandists and hired agents of somebody would have us submit the interests of America? Who are the members of this court to whom you rush with the fate of America in your hands?

Max Huber, president, of Switzerland.

Rafael Altamira y Crevea, of Spain.

Charles Andre Weiss, of France.

Dionisio Anzilotti, of Italy.

Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante, of Cuba.

Robert Bannatyne, Viscount Finlay, of Great Britain.

Bernard Cornelius J. Loder, of the Netherlands.

John Bassett Moore, a citizen of the United States, serving in a foreign country for a foreign salary.

Didrik Galtrup Gjedde Nyholm, of Denmark.

Yorozu Oda, of Japan.

Epitacio da Silva Pessoa, of Brazil.

Who are the deputy judges?

Frederick Valdemar Nikolai Beichmann, of Norway.

Mikhailo Jovanovitch, of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State.

Dumitriu Negulescu, of Rumania.

Wang Chung Hui, of China.

[Laughter.]

To these men you propose to submit questions in which America is concerned. A few days ago I read this list of names, and at once offense was taken. It was said I was appealing to a low sentiment when I was asking for consideration of the names. Then it was asserted that there were a large number of men with foreign names, or with peculiar names, in our country, and that some of them had served in the war. I do not call this list of names to create laughter because of their strangeness to our ears.

I call them to emphasize the fact that they are a body of foreign gentlemen representing foreign nations, many of them representing nations utterly different from ourselves, representing codes of law utterly different from our codes of law, representing systems of religion entirely different from our systems of religion. If my friend the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], whom I love and admire, were to quote the Scripture to this body over there, as he quotes it to us so frequently, only about three of those judges could understand his eloquent Alabama language, and none of them would know what he was talking about. It is a foreign court, named by the representatives of foreign nations, foreign in tongue, foreign in religion, foreign in basic thought, foreign in the principles of civilization, foreign in every way. Yet to this court we propose to consign the destinies of America, or we propose nothing.

It may be answered, of course, that John Bassett Moore is a citizen of the United States. How did he get on the court? He was selected by some foreign country to act as a decoy duck for the United States. The duck is not a very intelligent bird, but not one of them could ever be induced to alight in a pond with so transparent a decoy. John Bassett Moore may be there to-morrow and may be there the day after, but whether he is there or whether he is not there, I do not want John Bassett Moore or any other man to decide questions that concern America vitally. No body but an American tribunal created by the American people should decide such questions.

How would you gentlemen like to be sitting shivering in your chairs six months from now awaiting the decision of the World Court on some question involving the great interests of America, and speculating on how Yorozu Oda is going to vote on that question? How would you feel if you thought your fate depended upon the gentleman who bears the eupho-

nious name of Dionisio Anzilotti, or Didrik Galtrup Gjedde Nyholm, of Denmark, or Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante, of Cuba? Or, dropping down to the deputy judges who might be summoned, how would you like to have a question involving the Monroe doctrine settled by Mikhailo Javanovid or Dumitriu Negulescu or Wang Chung Hui?

Of course, I do not pronounce these names correctly, but if you enter the World Court you will have to learn how to pronounce them, and you will have to wait in breathless suspense the votes of these gentlemen when your country's fate is involved.

I cast no imputations upon these men. I do not care how exalted they may be in their respective countries; and I respect the countries of the earth. I do not care how earnest they may be in the laws of their lands. They are not bone of our bone; they are not flesh of our flesh; they are not wedded to our systems of law. They do not think as we think in many cases. They live under entirely different forms of government, and, as I shall show later on, those governments have interests absolutely opposed to the interests of the United States, and these judges will respond to the interests of their countries.

It is true that one of them, the gentleman from Japan, suggested that that would not be true, because, he said, the judges might be deified, and he said that in one of the solemn conventions of jurists who devised the statutes of the league court. If anybody disputes that I can produce the official record. He suggested that the judges could always be put in a position to be just by being deified, a doctrine not foreign at all to the philosophy of Japan, where they deify their ancestors and worship the ghosts of their departed.

It is to this body you propose to consign the fate of the United States, or you are playing battledore and shuttlecock with words and setting up a shadow and telling us that shadow will produce peace in the world and stop all wars, and yet you are saying that it does not possess power.

Mr. President, there were some internationalists in this country during the war. There were some internationalists in other countries. There is an international movement on. There are societies that were organized in Europe many years ago by Andrew Carnegie, whose estate's money is being expended to-day for propaganda for the very ideas he taught. There were people during the war who said that they believed in international peace and that they would not support this Government in the contest. We sent most of them to the penitentiary. There are people to-day who condemn the Bolsheviks for, as they claim, teaching Bolshevism to the world, teaching it in the form that there should be no national adherence and no national life, but that we should all be some sort of a general conglomerate.

I can not draw the line in principle between the doctrine of the Bolshevik or the proletariat who teaches that kind of internationalism, and the doctrine and philosophy taught by Andrew Carnegie, taught by his money, and taught by some men very close to this Chamber that we must sink our nationality into the vortex of the world and that we shall sacrifice American interests in the interests of the world at large.

For my part, when the world is on one side and America on the other, I shall think only of my country, for I shall know that when the light of America goes out the darkness of tyranny will return to the earth, and that there is no greater jeopardy to human freedom and no greater blow that can be struck to mankind in general than to impair the majesty and power of the leadership of this Nation.

Mr. President, I have made some reference to Mr. Carnegie. I hesitate to speak of a man who is dead. I speak of it now because he is largely the author of this movement. I speak of it because his money is now being expended in carrying on the propaganda. Therefore, that which he said when living and which is perpetuated by his dead hands, which lies largely at the basis of this doctrine of internationalism that is now being taught, is pertinent to the question, and I want to lay that article before the Senate.

In the article Mr. Carnegie laments the fact that we have rebelled against Great Britain. In the article he argues there was not sufficient cause. In the article he demands that the United States shall return to the mother country. Following that article he organized these societies all over the world and helped to finance them, and some of them are functioning to-day.

I send to the desk and ask to have read as a part of my remarks the article of Andrew Carnegie printed in the North American Review in 1893. True to his faith he returned to his native soil to die.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A LOOK AHEAD

(This article is the closing chapter of the new edition of *Triumphant Democracy*, embracing the results of the 1890 census, which is soon to be issued by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons.)

(By Andrew Carnegie)

I think one excusable who has been compelled to live for months among figures and hard facts and record only the past if, his task accomplished, he indulges in a look ahead, where not what is but what is to be is considered, and where, being no longer bound by results achieved, he is fancy free.

I have taken this privilege freely for myself in this closing chapter, and, Utopian as the dream may seem, I place on record my belief that it is one day to become a reality.

Until a little more than a hundred years ago the English-speaking race dwelt together in unity, the American being as much a citizen of Britain as the Scotsman, Welshman, or Irishman. A difference unhappily arose under the British Constitution, their common heritage, as to the right of the citizens of the older part of the state to tax their fellows in the newer part across the sea without their consent; but separation was not contemplated by Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Jay, and other leaders. On the contrary, these great men never ceased to proclaim their loyalty to and their desire to remain part of Britain, and they disclaimed any idea of separation, which was, indeed, accepted at last, but only when forced upon them as a sad necessity from which there was no honorable escape if they were to maintain the rights they had acquired not as American but as British citizens.

On the other hand, the motherland, which forced the issue upon her loyal citizens in America, sees nothing more clearly to-day than that she was in error, and that she converted a constitutional agitation for redress of grievances into a question of patriotic resistance to the exercise of unconstitutional power, an issue which Britons have never been slow to accept and have never failed successfully to meet. There is no British statesman who does not feel that if the Britons in America had not resisted taxation without representation and fought out the issue to the end they would have been false to the blood in their veins.

I desire to give my readers in the old land and in the new some idea of the position of the two parties after the difference between them arose.

The following quotations from the credentials presented by the delegates from several of the American Provinces to the First Continental Congress, organized September 5, 1774, show the spirit which then prevailed.

Delegates from the Province of New Hampshire were instructed—"To secure and to perpetuate their [the Colonies'] rights, liberties, and privileges and to restore that peace, harmony, and mutual confidence which once happily subsisted between the parent country and her Colonies."

Those of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, Samuel and John Adams among them, were charged to seek—

"The restoration of union and harmony between Great Britain and the Colonies, most ardently desired by all good men."

The great Province of Pennsylvania sent delegates for conference—"And for establishing that union and harmony between Great Britain and the Colonies which is indispensably necessary to the welfare and happiness of both."

Virginia wished its delegates, among whom were Washington, Randolph, and Lee—

"To secure British America from the ravage and ruin of arbitrary taxes and speedily to procure the return of that harmony and union so beneficial to the whole empire and so ardently desired by all British America."

We quote now from addresses and petitions adopted by the Continental Congress.

From an address to the people of Great Britain, approved October 21, 1774, and written, according to Jefferson, by John Jay:

"We believe there is yet much virtue, much justice, much public spirit in the English nation. To that justice we now appeal. You have been told that we are seditious, impatient of government, and desirous of independency. Be assured that these are not facts but calumnies. Permit us to be as free as yourselves, and we shall ever esteem a union with you to be our greatest glory and our greatest happiness."

From the petition of the Congress to the King:

"We ask but for peace, liberty, and safety. We wish not a diminution of the prerogative, nor do we solicit the grant of any new right in our favor. Your royal authority over us, and our connection with Great Britain, we shall always carefully and zealously endeavor to support and maintain."

On Monday, June 12, 1775, the Second Continental Congress passed a resolution for a fast, the Battles of Lexington and Concord having just taken place, seeking aid—

"To avert those desolating judgments with which we are threatened, and to bless our rightful sovereign, King George III."

From the declaration of Congress, setting forth the causes and necessity of taking up arms, adopted July 6, 1775, a few weeks after the Battle of Bunker Hill:

"Lest this declaration should disquiet the minds of our friends and fellow subjects in any part of the Empire, we assure them that we mean not to dissolve that union which has so long and so happily subsisted between us and which we sincerely wish to see restored. We have not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent states. We fight not for glory or for conquest."

From the petition to the King dated July 8, 1775, signed by the Members of the Congress present:

"Attached to Your Majesty's person, family, and government with all the devotion that principle and affection can inspire, connected with Great Britain by the strongest ties that can unite societies, and deploring every event that tends in any degree to weaken them, we solemnly assure Your Majesty that we not only most ardently desire the former harmony between her and these colonies may be restored, but that a concord may be established between them upon so firm a basis as to perpetuate its blessings, uninterrupted by any future dissensions, to succeeding generations in both countries."

From an address to the inhabitants of Great Britain, also adopted by the Congress July 8:

"We are accused of aiming at independence; but how is this accusation supported? By the allegations of your ministers, not by our actions. * * * Yet give us leave most solemnly to assure you that we have not yet lost sight of the object we have ever had in view, a reconciliation with you on constitutional principles, and a restoration of that friendly intercourse, which, to the advantage of both, we till lately maintained."

Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"* * * I am sincerely one of those and would rather be in dependence on Great Britain, properly limited, than on any nation on earth, or than on no nation."

"Believe me, dear sir, there is not in the British Empire a man who more cordially loves a union with Great Britain than I do."

Benjamin Franklin testified before the committee of the House of Commons:

"They [the colonists] consider themselves as a part of the British Empire, and as having one common interest with it; they may be looked on here as foreigners, but they do not consider themselves as such. They are zealous for the honor and prosperity of this nation; and, while they are well used, will always be ready to support it as far as their little power goes."—From the *Life of Franklin*, by John Bigelow. Lippincott. Vol. I, page 495.

On July 13, 1774, Jay was appointed a member of a committee of New York citizens to draw up resolutions on the nonimportation policy. This committee reported:

"That it is our greatest happiness and glory to have been born British subjects, and that we wish nothing more ardently than to live and die as such;" that "the act for blocking up the port of Boston is * * * subversive of every idea of British liberty;" and that it should be left to the proposed Congress to determine the question of nonimportation, which would be justified only by "dire necessity."—John Jay, by George Pellew, pages 31 and 32.

While the British-Americans were thus proclaiming their love, affection, and loyalty for the parent land, and pleading for British rights and the union, we turn to those in Britain who are now regarded as the greatest and wisest statesmen of that time. Hear the words of Pitt:

"It is my opinion that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the Colonies. At the same time I assert the authority of this Kingdom over the Colonies to be sovereign and supreme, in every circumstance of government and legislation whatsoever. They are the subjects of this Kingdom equally entitled with yourselves to all the natural rights of mankind, and the peculiar privileges of Englishmen; equally bound by its laws and equally participating in the constitution of this free country. The Americans are the sons, not the bastards of England. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the commons alone. * * * When, therefore, in this house we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? We, Your Majesty's commons for Great Britain, give and grant to Your Majesty, what? Our own property? No. We give and grant to Your Majesty the property of Your Majesty's commons in America. It is an absurdity in terms."—From a speech by William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, in the House of Commons, January 16, 1776.

Let us hear Burke:

"No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of 3 pence. But no commodity will bear 3 pence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and 2,000,000 of people are resolved not to pay. The feelings of the Colonies were formerly the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden when called upon for the pay-

ment of 20 shillings. Would 20 shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No; but the payment of half 20 shillings, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave."

"Again and again revert to your own principles—seek peace and ensue it—leave America, if she has taxable matter in her, to tax herself. I am not here going into the distinctions of rights, not attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions; I hate the very sound of them. Leave the Americans as they anciently stood, and these distinctions, born of our unhappy contest, will die along with it. They and we, and they and our ancestors, have been happy under that system. Let the memory of all actions in contradiction to that good old mode, on both sides, be extinguished forever. Be content to bind America by laws of trade; you have always done it. Let this be your reason for binding their trade. Do not burden them by taxes; you were not used to do so from the beginning. Let this be your reason for not taxing. These are the arguments of states and kingdoms. Leave the rest to the schools, for there only they may be discussed with safety."—From a speech on American taxation, delivered in the House of Commons April 19, 1774.

Horace Walpole said:

"You will not be surprised that I am what I always was, a zealot for liberty in every part of the globe, and consequently that I most heartily wish success to the Americans. They have hitherto not made one blunder; and the administration have made a thousand, besides the two capital ones of first provoking and then of uniting the Colonies. The latter seem to have as good heads and hearts as we want both." From a letter to Horace Mann, dated September 7, 1775. Horace Walpole and His World, Scribner's, page 152.

In a letter dated February 17, 1779, Horace Walpole says:

"Liberty has still a continent (America) to exist in. I do not care a straw who is minister in this abandoned country. It is the good old cause of freedom that I have at heart."

Isaac Barré, member of Parliament, 1761 to 1790, said, in reply to Lord North's declaration that he would never think of repealing the tea duty until he saw America prostrate at his feet:

"To effect this is not so easy as some imagine; the Americans are a numerous, a respectable, a hardy, a free people. But were it ever so easy, does any friend to his country really wish to see America thus humbled? In such a situation she would serve only as a monument of your arrogance and your folly. For my part, the America I wish to see is America increasing and prosperous, raising her head in graceful dignity, with freedom and firmness asserting her rights at your bar, vindicating her liberties, pleading her services, and conscious of her merit. This is the America that will have spirit to fight your battles, to sustain you when hard pushed by some prevailing foe, and by her industry will be able to consume your manufactures, support your trade, and pour wealth and splendor into your towns and cities. If we do not change our conduct toward her, America will be torn from our side. * * * Unless you repeal this law, you run the risk of losing America."

David Hartley, member of Parliament for Kingston-upon-Hull, in a speech in the house, May 15, 1777, concluded with these prophetic words:

"* * * I will venture to prophesy that the principles of a federal alliance are the only terms of peace that ever will and that ever ought to obtain between the two countries."

On November 2, 1775, Mr. Hartley concluded another speech with these words:

"Let the only contention henceforward between Great Britain and America be, which shall exceed the other in zeal for establishing the fundamental rights of liberty for all mankind."

Jonathan Shipley, Bishop of St. Asaph, in 1774, made a speech intended to have been spoken on the bill for altering the charters of the Colonies of Massachusetts Bay:

"Let them continue to enjoy the liberty our fathers gave them. Gave them, did I say? They are coheirs of liberty with ourselves; and their portion of the inheritance has been much better looked after than ours. My Lords, I look upon North America as the only great nursery of freemen now left upon the face of the earth. But whatever may be our future fate, the greatest glory that attends this country, a greater than any other nation ever acquired, is to have formed and nursed up to such a state of happiness those Colonies whom we are now so eager to butcher."

Both Briton and American being now fully agreed that those who made the attempt to tax without giving the right of representation were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens and therefore only did their duty, the question arises, Is a separation thus forced upon one of the parties, and now thus deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?

I can not think so, and I crave permission to adduce some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certainly to see a reunion of the separated parts and once again a common citizenship.

First. In race—and there is a great deal in race—the American remains three-fourths purely British. The mixture of the German, which constitutes substantially all of the remainder, though not strictly British, is yet Germanic. The Briton of to-day is himself composed in large measure of the Germanic element, and German, Briton, and American are all of the Teutonic race.

The amount of blood other than Anglo-Saxon and Germanic which has entered into the American is almost too trifling to deserve notice, and has been absorbed without changing him in any fundamental trait. The American remains British, differing less from the Briton than the Irishman, Scotsman, Welshman, and Englishman differ from each other. Englishmen, Scotsmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen are all Britons, and the American (a term which of course includes the Canadian) entering among these would be as near the common type resulting from a union of the five as any of the other parts. Indeed, the American in many respects resembles the Scotsman more than the Englishman does, and he also in other respects resembles the Englishman more than does the Scot. He resembles both Englishman and Scot much more than the Irishman resembles either. His introduction into a common British-American citizenship would not produce a resultant differing greatly from that of the present union of Scot, Welshman, Irishman, and Englishman. The action of a Congress elected by all these elements would not differ much upon fundamental questions affecting the rights, liberties, and privileges of the people from a Congress of Americans sitting in Washington, or of Canadians in Ottawa, or from the action of a British Parliament similarly elected sitting in London. No citizen of any of the present States, either British or American, would have reason to fear the loss of anything which he now holds dear. He could rest securely in the belief that his fellows of the other States could be trusted so to act that the united mass would not oscillate.

A feeling of confidence in each other among the respective communities of the race in Great Britain and America may be expected to grow as political institutions continue to assimilate.

It is to be noted that only in the region of political ideas is there dissimilarity, for no rupture whatever between the parts has ever taken place in language, literature, religion, or law. In these uniformity has always existed; although separated politically the unity of the parts has never been disturbed in these strong, cohesive, and cementing links. The books and periodicals read upon both sides of the Atlantic are rapidly becoming the same. The decision of one court is good law in all. Language remains uniform, every approved change in one part of the great realm rapidly being adopted throughout the English-speaking world. Religious ideas are the common property of the race. There seems nothing, therefore, to keep the sections of the race apart, but everything to reunite them.

Second. No one questions that if, instead of 1,800 miles of water between America and Britain, there lay another Mississippi Valley, the English-speaking race would be one politically, since the federal system of government has proved that immense areas can be successfully governed under one head, and can exist as one power, the freest government of the parts producing the strongest government of the whole. The difference of land and water lying between people has hitherto been great, and, in the words of the poet, instead of mountains, we can say that—

"Oceans interposed

Make enemies of nations, who had else,
Like kindred drops, been mingled into one."

This is quite true of the past; but oceans no longer constitute barriers between nations. These already furnish the cheapest of all modes of communication between men. It has been my good fortune recently to travel from the Pacific coast to Britain. The journey from San Francisco to New York was made in a moving hotel, in which our party traveled for six weeks and had every want supplied. The time necessary for the trip is five days. The other half of the journey, after a short rest at the halfway house, New York, was performed in one of the best ocean greyhounds, the time consumed from land to land being only a few hours more than that required for the journey from San Francisco to New York. Over land and over sea we had traveled under the best conditions of to-day. No luxury was wanting. The moving hotel over the land was the best of its kind, as was the moving hotel over the water. The ocean voyage was by far the less fatiguing and in every respect more comfortable than the overland journey.

The future is, probably, to render travel by sea, if not quite as fast, yet more comfortable to people in general than land travel can possibly be made. The delegate to a conference at Washington, leaving Liverpool or Southampton, now reaches that city in just about the same time as the delegate from San Francisco, Seattle, or Victoria, on the Pacific coast. At the time England and Scotland were united members of Parliament from the north of Scotland required as long to reach London. A short time ago many of the American Representatives to Congress consumed more time in reaching Washington than either of these. The time required is being lessened every year. The next three months are to see both the ocean and the land journey materially reduced.

Third. The telegraph connecting London, Edinburgh, Dublin, Cardiff, New Orleans, San Francisco, New York, Washington, Montreal, Quebec, and Ottawa, bringing all into instantaneous communication, is the most important factor in rendering political reunion possible, and I venture to say inevitable. Without this agency it might well be doubted whether one central authority could act for all the scattered parts, but when events and problems as they arise, and the discussions upon them at the center, can be instantly known at the extremities, and become everywhere the subject of contemporaneous debate and consideration, thus permitting the center to influence the extremities and the extremities to respond to the center, the pulse beat of the entire Nation can be constantly felt by the Government and all the people. No matter where the capital may be, it must still be omnipresent and in touch with all parts of the confederacy. Time is therefore no longer to be taken into account at all, and distance means but little when all can instantly hear everything that transpires.

Fourth. The advantages of a race confederation are so numerous and so obvious that one scarcely knows how to begin their enumeration. Consider its defensive power. A reunion of the Anglo-Americans, consisting to-day of 108,000,000, which 50 years hence will number more than 200,000,000, would be unassailable upon land by any power or combination of powers that it is possible to create. We need not, therefore, take into account attacks upon the land; as for the water, the combined fleets would sweep the seas. The new nation would dominate the world and banish from the earth its greatest stain—the murder of men by men. It would be the arbiter between nations and enforce the peaceful settlement of all quarrels, saying to any disputants who threatened to draw the sword:

"Hold! I command you both;
The one that stirs makes me his foe.
Unfold to me the cause of quarrel,
And I will judge betwixt you."

Such a giant among pigmies as the Re-United States would never need to exert its power, but only to intimate its wishes and decisions. It would be unnecessary for any power to maintain either a great standing army or a great navy. The smaller nations, having discovered that they would not be permitted to disturb the peace of the world, would naturally disarm. There would be no use in maintaining large forces either for attack or defense when the Anglo-American had determined that no one should attack. I believe that the wisdom of the reunited nation and its regard for others would be so great as to give it such moral ascendancy that there would be no disposition upon the part of any power to appeal from its decisions. All would acquire the habit of settling disputes by an appeal to this supreme tribunal, the friend of all, the enemy of none, without thought of ever going beyond its decrees.

Fifth. There are higher, though perhaps not more powerful, considerations than the material benefits involved in reunion. Regarding these I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of "imperial federation" dares to intimate that the federation he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question can not even be discussed when the imperial conferences meet. If it be introduced, it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British products as a matter of course. The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax can be laid upon products of any part of the union, even for revenue, although under "free trade" such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic "duty free" mean to the linen, woolen, iron, and steel industries of Scotland, to the tin-plate manufacturers of Wales, to the woolen and cotton, coal, iron, cutlery, and steel industries of England? It would mean prosperity to every industry in the United Kingdom, and this in turn would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interest, now so sorely depressed.

Few except those engaged in manufacturing realize the position of Britain as a manufacturer in regard to the American market. The ocean, which many are still apt to consider a barrier between the two countries, is the very agency which brings them so close and will ultimately bind them together. Coal, iron, steel, and all kinds of merchandise from Britain reach American ports more cheaply than American manufactures produced within a hundred miles of these ports. Thus the coal, iron, and steel from Glasgow, Hull, Newcastle, or Liverpool reach the cities of New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, Richmond, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Portland more cheaply than the same articles mined or manufactured in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee, or Alabama, the land carriage from these States being far greater than the ocean carriage from Great Britain. To the whole Pacific coast Britain is so much nearer in cost as to give her under reunion the complete command of that market. In the event of reunion, the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great populations skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Britain. The heavy products are taken from Britain to the United

States in many instances as ballast for nothing. The freight charge is generally trifling. I do not hesitate to say that reunion would bring with it such demand for British products as would tax the present capacity of Britain to the utmost, for the products of continental nations, which now compete so seriously with Britain, would be almost excluded, even by a tariff strictly for revenue. There would not be an idle mine, furnace, or factory in the land. The consumption of coal in the United States is already greater than in Britain; of iron and steel it is now fully double. Our consumption of tin plate exceeds that of all the rest of the world. The imports of British textile fabrics grow year after year. These never were so great as at present. The only nation which is taking more and more of British products is the Republic. The American market is enormous and constantly expanding. It is in vain that people in Britain hope for any radical change in the tariff laws. No party in the United States can or will make many material changes in these. Revenue will continue to be raised by duties upon imports as at present and chiefly upon the fine textile fabrics—the luxuries of the rich. There can be little question that nothing would so certainly insure the permanent prosperity of Britain as free access to the American market, which can be effected so easily through reunion, which would also bring with it enhanced value to land as the result of prosperity in all branches of British trade and industry; and were Britain and America again one, the American would find the former the best summer home within his reach. Many would purchase such homes there and secure for themselves the delights of a beneficial change of climate and contact with a thousand sources of sweet influences only to be gained in the old home of the race. The prophecy of the Spectator, made many years ago and just repeated, would be fully realized, that the British-American would find the old home his "restful park." It is not going too far to say that every kind of property in the sceptered isle and every business interest would be permanently doubled in value by reunion.

I do not shut my eyes to the fact that reunion, bringing free entrance of British products, would cause serious disturbance to many manufacturing interests near the Atlantic coast, which have been built up under the protective system. But, sensitive as the American is said to be to the influence of the dollar, there is a chord in his nature—the patriotic—which is much more sensitive still. Judging from my knowledge of the American manufacturers, there are few who would not gladly make the necessary pecuniary sacrifices to bring about a reunion of the old home and the new. There would be some opposition, of course, from those peculiarly interested, but this would be silenced by the chorus of approval from the people in general. No private interests or interests of a class or of a section of what would then be our common country would or should be allowed to obstruct a consummation so devoutly to be wished.

If the question be judged in Britain by the material benefits certain to flow from it, never in all her history was such enormous material gain within her reach, and never as much as now has the future position of Britain so urgently required just such an assurance of continued prosperity. The development of manufactures in other lands seriously menaces her future. She has already lost much in cotton manufacture, which I fear is never to be regained. The product of iron has fallen from nearly nine to less than seven millions of tons. We see decreases written too often in her trade statistics which might be charged to the ebb and flow of industrial affairs were they not accompanied by startling increases in like branches in competing nations.

Her position is the most artificial of all nations, islands that can not grow half enough of food to feed her people, but which produce double the amount of manufactured articles they can consume. Such a nation in order to be secure of her future must have a market for these surplus articles and more land from which to draw food for her people. This is precisely what reunion offers—the most valuable and the most rapidly increasing market in the world for her manufactures, and the richest soil for the production of the food she requires. Reunion restores her to ownership in hundreds of millions of acres of fresh, fertile soil, the like of which is elsewhere unknown, reopens a market for her manufactures sufficient even to-day to absorb all her surplus.

Reunion will further benefit the United Kingdom in regard to debt and taxation, potent factors in the industrial race of nations. The national debt per capita of the United States, amounts to \$14, that of Britain to \$88, that of Canada to \$48. The percentage of taxation in the United States, national, State, and local, to earnings was 5.04 last decade; in the United Kingdom, 9.03—nearly double. When the union is restored it will be upon the basis of uniting also the national debts as they stand, and making all a common obligation of the union, so that the United Kingdom would be relieved at once of the greater portion of its national debt, and of at least one-half of all its present heavy taxation, even if no reduction of expenditure resulted from having one general government, one army and navy instead of two. About one-fourth of all national taxation in recent years in the Republic has gone in payment of debt, and a much greater proportion recently for pensions, which are temporary, so that the current expenses of the general government will after a time not require more than one-half the present amount of taxation.

The only course for Britain seems to be reunion with her giant child, or sure decline to a secondary place, and then to comparative insignificance in the future annals of the English-speaking race, which is to increase so rapidly in America. Heaven forbid that she who has been and yet is so great, and still so deeply revered, should unwisely choose continued separation and tread a by-path apart leading to an inglorious career. Let her statesmen study the situation, therefore, and learn that reunion with her American children is the only sure way to prevent continued decline. Reunited with these, Britain takes a new lease of prosperity; decline is arrested and increase begins.

Sixth. The influence upon the individual citizen of power in the state and especially of power used for great and good ends is immeasurable. The conquering Briton has conquered more and more easily as he has had behind him more and more of a record of achievements of his race. "I am a Roman citizen" was a boast which made him who uttered it not only a greater Roman but a greater man. To develop heroes there must be occasions for heroism. To develop statesmen the state must have a great part to play in the world. Had the Republic remained a mere colony it would never have discovered its Franklin, Adams, Hamilton, and Hancock, and what would the world have known of Washington? What part could he have ever played to make him Washington? What would the world have known of that genius Lincoln, the greatest statesman of the century, or of many centuries, had he not been called upon to preserve the Republic, and with a stroke of the pen to make 4,000,000 slaves freemen? In like manner Hampden, Pym, Elliott and Cromwell would have remained comparatively obscure men but for the part which it was possible for them to play upon so large a stage as Britain. What the British boy grows to be as a citizen largely depends upon how he is fashioned by knowing and dwelling upon the history of his country's triumphs and of its leaders in the past. What would the American boy become as a citizen if he had not his Washington and other Revolutionary heroes to inspire him, and cause the blood to tingle in his veins as he reads the story of his country's struggle for independence? What kind of a man would the Scotsman be if bereft of the glorious history of his country and its sacrifices for the cause of civil and religious liberty? He is fed upon and becomes part of Wallace, Knox, and Burns. Every state should aim to be great and powerful, and noble in the exercise of its power, because power in the state, nobly exercised, is the strongest influence in producing good and patriotic citizens. Every citizen, being a constituent part of the state under democracy, partakes in some measure of its greatness. A small and petty political unity tends to breed small and petty men of all classes; dealing with great affairs broadens and elevates the character. All these and many other considerations plead for reunion.

Let us now consider the position and feelings of the various parts of the English-speaking world toward reunion, beginning with Canada. Canada would undoubtedly favor reunion. She would gladly reenter a race federation of which Britain and the United States were again the other members. Therefore it can be said of her: "She is ready."

Touching the United States, we find the American Union constantly adding States. The original 13 have now swollen to 44. Other States, now in process of formation, will soon raise the number to 50. So quietly are these admissions made that the Nation is scarcely aware of them. A convention of the people of a Territory decides to ask admission to the Union as a State; Congress passes a bill of a few lines, which the President signs, admitting the new member. Elections are held in the new State for governor, members of a State legislature, and officers of the State, and also for Representatives and Senators. The latter make their appearance in Washington, present their credentials, take the oath and their seat in the national councils. There is nothing more to be done. The State attends to all its internal affairs, and the General Government attends to all general matters. The American people are favorable to the extension of national boundaries. No evil, but great good, has come from every succeeding addition to their union. Therefore a proposition to reunite Britain and the Republic would not seem anything novel to them. They are used to territorial extension.

The reunion idea would be hailed with enthusiasm. No idea yet promulgated since the formation of union would create such unalloyed satisfaction. It would sweep the country. No party would oppose, each would try to excel the other in approval. Therefore as of Canada so of the Republic we can say: "She is ready."

Here we have two members out of the three secured. As far as these are concerned, the question might be raised to-morrow. It is only when we approach the old home that we are compelled to recognize that it is not yet ripe for reunion. But this can not even be said of all of its members. In one of the islands a proposal to become part of the great British-American nation would be hailed with delight. We can safely say of Ireland: "She is ready."

The position of Scotland in the United Kingdom is that of a small State overshadowed by a great one. She is dissatisfied and is to-day demanding power to govern herself after her own ideas. Her posi-

tion as a State among the proposed States of the great reunion would be more desirable and infinitely more exalted and more independent in every respect than her present position as a State in the small union of England, Ireland, and Wales. And not one particle would she be less distinctively Scotland than she is Scotland to-day. Indeed, she would be more Scotland than she is now Scotland, because the rights which a State in the reunion would hold are the rights of sovereignty. She would be supreme within her borders with a national parliament and full control over her land, her church, her education, and all her national institutions. She would only surrender to a general parliament control of certain stated affairs of an international character. After a short campaign of explanation throughout my native land I am confident we should be able to say of Scotland, "She is ready"; and what Scotland requires is all that Wales requires, when of her we could also say, "She is ready." Her status would also be raised, not depressed, by reentering the greater union. Scotland would be more Scotland, Ireland more Ireland, Wales more Wales than they are at present. What great difference would it make to Wales, Ireland, and Scotland if their representatives to the supreme council should proceed to Washington instead of to London? Yet this is all the change that would be required, and for this they would have insured to them all the rights of independent States and free access to the only market which can make and keep them prosperous.

The sole remaining member is England, and we confess that much has to be accomplished in the way of change before she can be induced to again accept the headship of the race as the oldest and most revered member in a great reunion which, however, she could not expect to dominate as she now dominates the present union of the three small States, containing less than one-third of her own population, which constitute with her the United Kingdom. But the greater union would be one in which although she could not be all-powerful, yet she would undoubtedly be first, and regarded with all the deference due to age and motherhood.

At first glance the Briton who considers this question may feel that the proposed reunion would involve the giving up of his separate nationality, with its unequaled history, its triumphs, and all that makes the sceptered isle the object of his love and admiration. There is nothing whatever in this. Not a line of the long scroll would be dimmed, not a word erased. The past can not be obscured, and the future, under the proposed reunion with the other branches of her own race, may be trusted to be grander than the past, as the power and career of the reunited nation must be greater than that of any of its branches. Officials may be expected to denounce the idea of reunion, fearing that their positions under the new régime would be, not less dignified, but less likely to be theirs. But the people of Britain have no cause to fear that anything would be taken from them, and every reason to see that much would be added. We observe in the history of the world that patriotism is ever expansive. Centuries ago the people of Perugia and Assisi, 15 miles apart, were deadly enemies, attacked each other, and played at making war and treaties. Even St. Francis was wounded in one of these campaigns. The patriotism of the Perugian and the Assisian could not embrace an area so great as 15 miles. To-day patriotism stretches over hundreds of miles, in some cases thousands of miles, and does not lose but gain in intensity as it covers a wider area. There is more to be patriotic about. The patriotism of to-day, which melts when pushed beyond the shores of the island of Britain, may safely be trusted to partake in the near future of the expansive quality. It will soon grow and cover the doings of the race wherever situated, beyond the bounds of the old home. Professor Freeman, under the influence of this wider and nobler patriotism, has already been compelled to declare:

"He is no Englishman at heart, he has no true feeling of the abiding tie of kindred, who deems that the glory and greatness of the child (Republic) is other than part of the glory and greatness of the parent."

National patriotism or pride can not, therefore, prove a serious obstacle in the way of reunion.

It is to be carefully pondered that had separation never occurred it would long since have been necessary for the larger part of the population to be represented in the General Parliament. It is not conceivable that seventy millions of citizens upon one side of the Atlantic would consent to be governed by thirty-eight on the other. If they were so, they would prove themselves most undesirable members of any union. Free-born Britons should have no union with such people. It is because they are British and masterful and will have equality with other Britons that it is desirable or even safe to unite with them. Long ere this, therefore, the representatives of 70,000,000 would be greater in number than the representatives of 38,000,000; and consequently the condition of England or even Britain in this Greater Britain could not have been that of one member overshadowing all the rest. When reunion takes place no one State can have such power. England would be more powerful than any six of the numerous States; but she would not be more powerful than all combined. Nor is it desirable that any one member should be so. If Britain were to stand for this, it would be equivalent to saying that

even if the American Colonies had not seceded she herself would have seceded from them under the policy of rule or ruin and of refusal to consider her fellow citizens as political equals.

Numerous as would be the States comprising the reunited nation, each possessing equal rights, still Britain, as the home of the race, would ever retain precedence—first among equals. However great the number of the children who might sit around her in council, there could never be but one mother, and that mother, Britain.

To resolve to enter no federation of the race in which Britain's vote would not outweigh all the others combined would be to assign to Britain a petty future indeed, since the race can not increase much in the United Kingdom and is certain to be soon numbered by hundreds of millions in America. "Think what we lost when we lost you," said a Briton recently to an American. "Ah," replied the American, "but just think what we lost." "What did you lose?" "Britain," was the reply. This was true; the loss was mutual—as the gain from reunion will be mutual. Each in losing itself will regain the other.

The impediments to reunion may here be mentioned and considered:

First among these the great colonial empire, upon which Britain justly dwells with pride. The colonial, however, is a mere temporary stage in the development of nations. All colonies which prosper and grow ultimately develop into independent states. These always have done so, and they always will. It is certain that Australasia will have a new confederation if she fulfills the expectations of many as to her future growth. If, however, she does not increase in the future faster than she has been doing for sometime, she will no doubt long remain as at present under the protectorate of the old land. There would be no objection to her remaining under the protection of the reunion. The numerous small settlements and dependencies could in like manner also remain. There is, therefore, no valid obstacle in the colonial feature.

India, with its grave responsibilities, remains. No branch of the race now clear of any share in these would willingly consent to become a partner in them. India, called the "Brightest Jewel in the Crown," may be "red" again some day. My experience in India, traveling as an American, gave me an insight into the forces and aspirations of its people which the citizen of the conquering nation is never permitted to obtain. The wisest and most cautious statesmanship alone can lead in peace the two hundred and eighty millions of India to self-government; and much has been done by the education of the people to render the bestowal of self-government upon them inevitable. British occupation of that vast country is necessarily temporary. Britain will ever long be relieved from its dangerous position there. The right of self-government will be granted to the people, who will be ready upon short notice to establish themselves as an independent power. There is really no longer any decided advantage to the parent land in colonies, or in dependencies like India, since there has been conferred upon these freedom of trade with all nations and the right to tax imports, even from the parent land. Britain retains the trade of these regions because she can best supply their wants and this she could do just as completely were they independent. Trade pays no attention to flags; it follows the lowest price current. India, therefore, can soon be placed upon the road to independence and the British-American Union would guide it to this as well as the present Union of the United Kingdom.

The position of Britain in regard to European questions, which might alarm America, is rapidly changing. The doctrine of nonintervention is strong enough, even to-day, to give her practical immunity from participation in European wars. Were Britain part of the Re-United States all that she would be interested about in Europe would be fully secured; namely, the protection of her own soil and the command of the seas. No balance of power, no occupation of Egypt, or any similar question would be of the slightest importance. The reunited nation would be prompt to repel any assault upon the soil or the rights of any of its parts.

The monarchical form of government is admittedly a cause of disunion, but this form is not eterne. Scarcely a session of Parliament passes which does not in some department bring about an assimilation of political institutions to those of Canada and the United States. It is recognized by all that Britain is no longer a government of the few, but has really become in substance a democracy. A house of hereditary legislators is of all present institutions probably destined to have the shortest life in Britain. The House of Lords is not effective as a legislative chamber, even to-day. With its abolition or reform the question of maintaining an hereditary head of the state will follow. The opinion is often expressed in Britain that the Prince of Wales is probably to be the last official sitting by hereditary right. It is said that this opinion has been expressed by the prince himself. From what wise friends who know the prince tell me, I am persuaded that he is the last man in the world to stand in the way of healing a separation which he so constantly deplores, and unless the estimate formed by all, of the patriotism, virtues, and character of Her Majesty herself be strangely awry, she would give up much beyond her crown to be the peacemaker who brought reunion to her race. Strange almost beyond explanation is the fact that this woman, from one point of

view bereft of political power, a mere instrument in the hands of her elected ministers, nevertheless is in this omnipotent. She is the only one who could by a sublime act reunite the separated branches of her race. Never in the history of the world has it been in the power of any human being to perform so great an act, or to secure so commanding a place among "the immortal few who were not born to die." All the saints in the calendar would give place to St. Victoria were Providence to favor her by calling her to perform a mission so fraught with blessing to her people and to the world. There would be but two names set apart forever in the annals of the English-speaking race—names further beyond all other names than any name now known to man is beyond that of all his fellows—Victoria and Washington—patron saints of our race; he the conqueror, who manlike drew the sword in righteous quarrel; she, womanlike, the angel of peace and reconciliation; each adding luster to the other and equal in power and glory.

For such a mission and such a destiny even Queen Victoria on bended knee might pray.

In England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales a proposition to make all officials elective by the people after Victoria passes away, which God grant must be long is the prayer of every American, would command a heavy vote. It is thought by many that the majority would be great, indeed, in all the members of the United Kingdom for the abolition of hereditary legislators. Before the question of reunion is ripe for settlement in England there will remain no trace of hereditary privilege. As the Scotsman some years ago so well said: "Democracy means, and rightly means, that privilege shall cease."

There remains the question of the established church, which at present would create an insuperable obstacle to reunion; but it has already been abolished in one of the members of the United Kingdom and is about to be abolished in another; and it is only a question of a few years ere it be also abolished in Scotland.

This leaves us again with only England as the obstructive member to reunion; but as with the House of Lords, the colonial system, and the monarchy, so with the established church, even in England. What has been adopted in three members of the United Kingdom will finally be adopted in the fourth. The tendency of the age is fatal to making any sect the favorite of the State. Equal protection to all, favor to none, is the doctrine in regard to religious bodies. The question of an established church in the one member, England, therefore, will not exist to prevent reunion.

We might from one point of view consider the idea of "imperial federation" an obstacle to reunion, but it is really a help, for the discussion of that question can only pave the way for the acceptance of the only desirable federation. It needs only to be pointed out to Britain that, granted imperial federation acquired, she would obtain little or no extension of markets and could then only hope to be a member of a union which comprised a very small portion of the race. The growth of the English-speaking race during the last 10 years is ominous when considered in its bearing upon the imperial federation idea. In 1880 a federation of England and her colonies would have contained 42,308,843 people. The population of the Republic at that time was 50,155,783. Contrast now these figures with those of 1890. Imperial federation would have embraced in 1890, 46,437,974. The population of the Republic was then 62,622,250. Thus in 10 short years the American Republic has added twelve and a half millions to its population; the members of the proposed "imperial federation" only four and a quarter millions. The United Kingdom increased only 2,638,000, Canada only 508,000, Australasia—Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, New Zealand, Tasmania, etc.—combined, only 1,024,193, sundry small settlements the remainder.

Let it be assumed that the two branches increase in the same proportion as for the last 10 years, and

1900 will show:	
Imperial federation	50,600,000
The Republic	78,100,000
1910 will show:	
Imperial federation	55,600,000
The Republic	97,600,000
1920 will show:	
Imperial federation	61,100,000
The Republic	122,000,000
1930 will show:	
Imperial federation	67,200,000
The Republic	152,500,000
1940 will show:	
Imperial federation	73,900,000
The Republic	190,600,000

This will be the result only 50 years hence, when men now in manhood will still be living.

If the estimate be carried forward for 50 years more, making the complete century, the figures will stand:

Imperial federation	119,000,000
The Republic	581,000,000

We have considered here the two parts—Republic and Empire—as two solid bodies, the increase of the Republic, 1880 to 1890, having been 24.87 per cent, the empire's average increase 10 per cent; the United Kingdom's increase—8.17—has been, of course, less than the

average; Canada's increase, 11 per cent, just 1 per cent above the average; and Australasia's percentage of increase much higher, 39 per cent. It is not probable that any of the parts in either empire or Republic will maintain the past rate of increase; especially is it considered improbable by experts that the United Kingdom can increase much, since other countries are becoming better able to supply their own wants. Australasia has only added 1,000,000 in 10 years, and this chiefly in the first years of the decade. Her future, as the home of a great population, is not yet considered quite clear. Canada, under present conditions, is not likely to do more than maintain her slow rate of increase. The Republic seems likely to more nearly keep up its present rate of increase than the others, so that it is quite safe to assume that at least the relative difference between imperial federation and the United States, here indicated, will be maintained.

If Britain, America, and Canada were to reunite to-day, the population of the reunion would be 108,000,000. All the other parts of the English-speaking race would not number 5,000,000. It is into such a complete race reunion of her people that the door is now wide open for the parent land to enter and take first place—first among equals. In view of this high destiny, hers for the asking, who is he among her citizens who can sit down and deliberately plan for his country such a future as these figures prove would be hers under imperial federation. I can not understand how any true Briton can so far forget what is due to the mother land. No patriot surely can or will longer connect himself with a movement which has for its aim so miserable an end. If the imperial federationist be willing to unite with a few millions of people at the antipodes, who will not even entertain the idea of imports under free trade, much less "duty free," what objection can he raise to reunion with the main body of our race, only five days' sail from his shores, who offer not free trade only, which allows taxes upon imports for revenue, but entrance of everything duty free. I confidently appeal to the sterling patriotism which animates the imperial federationists and inspires them with ardent wishes for the future of their land to discard the narrow idea which tends to defeat their dearest hope. I beseech them to come with us who seek the reunion of all.

In the affairs of nations as well as in those of individuals there is a tide which not taken at the flood swings the ship of state from the main channel into the shoals and eddies where future progress is impossible.

It may confidently be expected there will arise in Britain a strong public sentiment protesting against the effort of some to relegate her to a subordinate rôle through an imperial federation which fails to federate the mass of the race.

From a review of the present position of the question we find that even to-day we can say Canada, the United States, and Ireland are ready for reunion; that Scotland presents no great difficulty; neither does Wales, and both have everything to gain and nothing to lose by reunion; and that the causes of continued disunion which admittedly exist in England are rapidly vanishing and are all melting away like snow in the sunshine; the colonial empire, the Indian question, European entanglements present no insuperable obstacle, and hereditary privilege and a national church are doomed. The present generation is to find several of these obstructions abolished; the succeeding generation probably is to find no trace of any of them.

Let no man imagine that I write as a partisan in dealing with these questions. I know no party in this great argument either in America or in Britain. Whatever obstructs reunion I oppose, whatever promotes reunion I favor. I judge all political questions from this standpoint. All party divisions sink into nothingness in my thoughts compared with the reunion of our race.

The ground thus cleared in the only member in which it is now cumbered, there is presented to us the spectacle of three branches of the race, Britain, Canada, and America, formerly united and now enjoying similar institutions but remaining disunited. We seek in vain for any reason why the old quarrel should not be healed, why those separated by a difference which no longer exists should not let the dead past bury its dead, and once more unite as parts of one great whole, just as the two parts of the Republic, plunged into civil war by the question of slavery, have again united in bonds more loving and more enduring than ever; just as Scotland and England, after long wars and separate existence, have been united, to the incalculable advantage of both; just as the Provinces of Canada have united all the three branches in one dominion, having had in their own histories experience of the evils and cost of separation and likewise of the advantages flowing from union. That each should now consider a reunion on a greater scale, and yet only a repetition of what each has already made upon a smaller scale, seems the most natural thing in the world. The residents of any member of the reunited nation will be nearer in time to the common center than the residents of the north of Scotland were to London at the time of the union; nearer than the residents of the extremities of the Republic were to Philadelphia when the Federal Union was formed. And in addition to this the citizen in any part of the new federation, by means of the telegraph, really will sit within the precincts of the Capitol; almost, it might be said,

within hearing of the proceedings of the national councils. Properly viewed, the reunion of the Briton, American, and Canadian will be less of a step forward than was the union of Scotland and England, the union of the Provinces of Canada, or the American Union, the parts to be reunited by such a federation being in every true sense nearer together, and the new empire more compact, than were the parts of either of these three unions at the date of their origin.

The means by which reunion is to be accomplished are ready to hand. There is sitting at this moment in Paris a conference composed of delegates from London, Ottawa, and Washington charged by the three branches of our race to obtain a satisfactory basis for the preservation of the seals in Bering Sea. After their task has been concluded the same distinguished men, each among the foremost citizens of the respective branches, could meet in London and suggest a basis for restoring the union which only a century ago so happily existed between Britain, Canada, and America and made them one nation. It would be so easy a task that its very simplicity amazes and renders us incredulous, but most of the important successes and most valuable discoveries have been remarkable for this very feature.

As easy as Le Cling's setting types, as easy as Franklin's drawing the lightning down, as Newton's divining the meaning of a falling apple, or Galileo of a swinging lamp, or Watts the raising of a kettle lid by the force of the escaping steam, as Spencer's survival of the fittest, as Darwin's origin of species, as Columbus sailing westward, or the making of the American Constitution—the Gordian knot is always easily cut, so easily that the only wonder is that it was not done before. Nothing mysterious, elaborate, or difficult reaches to the root and changes the face of the world, or the trend of events. The road always lies broad, open, straight, obvious to all transcendent successes; there is no hidden, tortuous, and narrow path to anything truly great. Some day, therefore, delegates from the three now separated branches will meet in London and readily agree upon and report for approval and ratification a basis for the restoration of an indissoluble union of indestructible states.

This may all seem Utopian, but we have had many prophetic voices, concerning both Britain and America, more than fulfilled, which were at the time of their inspired utterance much wilder than anything herein suggested. It may be all a dream and I but a mere dreamer of dreams. So be it. But if it be true that he who always dreams accomplishes nothing, so also is it none the less true that he who never dreams is equally barren of achievement. And if it be a dream, it is a dream nobler than most realities. If it is never to be realized, none the less it should be realized, and shame to those who come after us if it be not. I believe it will be, for all progress is upon its side. All that tends to the brotherhood of man tends to promote it. The tendency of the age is toward consolidation. We have behind us and with us, urging its consummation, all the mighty forces of civilization. The parliament of man and the federation of the world have already been hailed by the poet, and these mean a step much farther in advance of the proposed reunion of Britain and America than that reunion is in advance of the Canadian Confederation, of the American Union, or the Union of England and Scotland, all already accomplished.

Readers will kindly note that this is a look ahead—how far ahead I shall not attempt to guess—nevertheless it is ahead, and some time, somehow, it is to come to pass. I see it with the eye of faith, the faith of the devotee which carries with it a realizing sense of certain fulfillment.

Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever.

Let men say what they will, therefore, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again "The Re-United States," "The British-American Union."

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

During the reading of the article,

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	Heflin	McNary
Bingham	Ferris	Howell	Mayfield
Blease	Fess	Johnson	Metcalf
Borah	Frazier	Jones, Wash.	Moses
Brookhart	George	Kendrick	Norbeck
Butler	Gillett	Keyes	Norris
Capper	Goff	King	Nye
Copeland	Gooding	La Follette	Oddie
Curtis	Hale	Lenroot	Overman
Dale	Harris	McKellar	Pepper
Deneen	Harrison	McMaster	Pine

Pittman	Schall	Stanfield	Warren
Reed, Mo.	Sheppard	Swanson	Watson
Reed, Pa.	Shipstead	Trammell	Weller
Robinson, Ark.	Smith	Wadsworth	Wheeler
Sackett	Smoot	Walsh	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The reading of the article from the North American Review having been concluded,

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Missouri desire to conclude his speech to-night?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, if the Senator will yield to me, I will make a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will be glad to yield.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I suggest to the Senator that he make it 12 o'clock.

Mr. CURTIS. We can not do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1926, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, January 19, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name. Wilt thou come to us in the compassion of our heavenly Father. Thou who giveth us all things richly to enjoy, in chastisement and rebuke, remember mercy. Do Thou stoop to our needs and help us to see great things out of Thy law. Grant newness of zeal and opportunity to all. Oh, teach us how the good may prevail and help us to hold onto its achievements. May we hear the call to the higher states of power and blessing. Keep before us not success, not greatness, not victory, but fidelity to the public good, through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?

Mr. LINTHICUM. To ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if it is not to read into the Record a speech by Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, I shall not object; but if it is on that subject, I shall object.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say to the gentleman that it is not on that subject. If it were on that subject, it could not be done in two minutes. That is not my purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object. It takes up time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am only asking for two minutes. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may be allowed one minute in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. The same objection.

NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. It is evident that there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will summon the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The doors were closed.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Auf der Heide	Cullen	Haugen	Parks
Barkley	Darrow	Hawley	Phillips
Bell	Davey	Hudson	Purnell
Berger	Deal	Johnson, Ill.	Quayle
Black, N. Y.	Dempsey	Kless	Raker
Bloom	Denison	Kindred	Ransley
Boylan	Dickinson, Iowa	McFadden	Rayburn
Brand, Ohio	Dickstein	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rouse
Brigham	Doyle	McSwain	Sanders, N. Y.
Burdick	Esterly	MacGregor	Somers, N. Y.
Butler	Fredericks	Mead	Spearing
Canfield	Free	Merritt	Sullivan
Carew	Fuller	Morin	Sumners, Tex.
Celler	Gallivan	Norton	Upshaw
Connally, Tex.	Glynn	O'Connell, N. Y.	Wefald
Connolly, Pa.	Golder	O'Connor, La.	Welsh
Cooper, Wis.	Goldsborough	O'Connor, N. Y.	Zihlman
Crowther	Green, Iowa	Parker	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MAPES) was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7554, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7554) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself one hour at first. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, are they to be the gentleman's own remarks or some printed matter?

Mr. FRENCH. They will be my own remarks, though I may use a quotation here and there, or something of that kind; but it will be right on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to ask that for a time I be not interrupted, as I shall plan to cover the essential items in the bill and the programs we have had in mind in shaping the recommendations that we bring to your consideration. In that way I think we shall make progress.

To-day we take up consideration of the Navy appropriation bill, and in my opening statement I want to present a sort of general picture of the Navy, of the factors your committee had to take into consideration in shaping the bill, and indicate to you not only the items as we see them involved in the present bill but point out in a general way future policy as it involves appropriations from our Government.

We must have a Navy that is adequate to the country's defense and adequate to such emergencies as it is possible for human foresight to indicate will arise within any near future.